

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXXII No. 4 OCTOBER 1949

THE CENTENARY OF THE LONDON ORATORY¹

THE story of the London Oratory begins in an old whiskey store in King William Street, Strand, in the year 1849. Father Newman had returned from Rome in the previous year to found the first English Oratory at Birmingham, and it was from there that he sent Father Faber with five other priests, two novices and three lay brothers, to open the London house. The city was by then riding on a flood tide of growing prosperity; the preliminaries of the Great Exhibition were in hand, and the material greatness of the country, of which that event was so admirable an expression, was observable on all hands. So also was the poverty of the "submerged tenth", though it was not good form to call attention to it. Behind the splendid streets of sparkling shops, stuffed with every luxury known to man, lay meaner, dingier ways which in their turn gave on to courts and yards of dreadful squalor where lived the poor, herded together without air, sunlight or human decencies. King William Street lay on the edge of just such an area. The Lowther Rooms, once a dance hall and later a spirit store, was the place taken for the Oratory, and it was not long before the Fathers knew all about the reverse side of the golden medal.

The other phenomenon which confronted them was a less formidable, if more violent, one—Protestant opposition. It is difficult today to recapture the violence and unreasoning malice of the average early-Victorian Englishman's attitude to the Catholic Church. For generations English children had been brought up to regard it as the Mystery of Iniquity, a sort of horrible snake, at once spineless and powerful, which, once its python coils had gripped a victim, choked the life slowly out of

¹ This article is based on, and in part extracted from, the writer's illustrated monograph *The London Oratory 1849-1949*, published by the Fathers of the London Oratory, and obtainable (price 7s. 6d.) from the Oratory Book Shop, London, S.W. 7.

him, gloating the while over the death-struggles. Removed as they were from any first-hand experience of Catholicism, ordinary people were able to accept the picture presented, as the Russian people today accept the official picture of Western Europe; something which, utterly removed from reality though it was, was nevertheless unquestioned.

The small body of Catholics which remained in England had long accepted this attitude as inevitable and unalterable, and their religious life was so ordered as to efface any outward expression of it which might attract attention; the primary object of both clergy and laity was to avoid notice as far as possible, and, when obliged to show themselves as Catholics, to minimize, not indeed the Faith, but the difference which it made between themselves and their neighbours. Wilfrid Ward has called this position of the Church a state of siege, and although Emancipation had been granted in 1829, the mentality of both besieged and besieger had not yet changed.

It was Wiseman who first, in London, projected a reorientation of tactics, and he found in Faber an able lieutenant who based his plan of operations on a wholly new approach. Faber had visited the Continent while still an Anglican, expressly to study Roman methods of presenting the Faith. His buoyant, revivalist spirit revolted against the caution and what seemed to him the pusillanimity of his fellow Catholics. He determined that attack, not defence, was the watchword to adopt. Audacity, fearlessness, even bravado, were the marks of the Oratorian advance on the Protestant capital.

From the first, therefore, the new chapel was run on thoroughly "Roman" lines. It was open all day; bright, even splendid, with hangings and decorations; vestments and devotions alike Italianate and glittering, frequent sermons and hymns with popular music, all these were novel and daring to the last degree. The Fathers wore their habits in the street—a piece of impudence which particularly enraged the sturdy Protestant Londoner. *Punch*—mouthpiece of moneyed middle-class opinion—made frequent, and invariably offensive, references to the Oratorians, both in text and picture. Nervous Catholics also voiced disapproval of this twisting of the lion's tail—they still felt the breath of the pursuivant on their necks.

Wiseman, however, was a constant protector to the new venture and was always ready with encouragement.

From the beginning, results showed how rightly Faber had judged the position. Antagonism often defeated its own end by merely advertising the Oratory, and the community was soon staggering under its load of work. Converts, preaching, confessions, lectures, all had to be attended to, while Faber insisted on a full community life from the beginning. He himself was continually preaching and giving retreats, besides writing a veritable flood of hymns, verses and spirituality. During the Lent of 1850 he gave a fortnight's retreat, preached twenty-six sermons and was constantly interviewing and giving advice and instruction.

Faber required the most careful and exact performance of liturgical functions and thus laid the foundation of a continuous tradition which included musical performance of the highest standard attainable. The introduction of the Forty Hours Devotion during this Lent gave an opportunity for particular splendour and brilliance, while an attraction of another kind was provided by Newman, who came to deliver his famous lectures on Anglican difficulties.

Important as the external ceremonial was in bringing the true nature of the Catholic religion before the people of London, it was not regarded by the Fathers as their sole object. The Oratory has always included, after the pattern of its founder, a special mission to the young men of the cities where it is established. To assist them in overcoming the particular dangers associated with city life a brotherhood, known as the Little Oratory, is always formed, on the principles of St Philip's first gatherings in Rome. Its purpose is to enable these youths to refresh and strengthen their own religious life, and to express it in different external works. Hospital visiting had been a favourite means of St Philip. The instruction of the ignorant was the principal instrument now employed in London, where vast numbers of the Catholics among the very poor were pitifully ignorant of even the elements of their religion. The first of a long line of schools was founded in Rose Street, Covent Garden, under the guidance of Antony Hutchison, and here the Brothers were given a chance to exercise their charity by teach-

ing the Catechism under the direction of the Fathers. Many other societies were founded, some with temporal ends, such as a lodging-house, others with spiritual, like the Confraternity of the Precious Blood, which soon numbered over 1000 members praying for the day-to-day needs of themselves and of the Oratory. The persistent labour at high pressure, though it took toll of the health of the Fathers, soon produced remarkable results. The chapel quickly became too small to serve the numbers who wished to come to it, and Faber was, within three years of arrival, thinking about larger premises. Many proposals were made and different sites were considered, but ill luck seemed to attend the attempts to secure any of them. The Community made a vow to dedicate their new church to the Immaculate Heart of Mary if she would find them a place, and soon afterwards Brompton was mentioned. It seemed an unpromising proposal. Brompton was a village some way from London, served by a very indifferent road from Hyde Park Corner. Newman feared that a house there would be nothing more than a country place, though he left the decision to those on the spot. Indications of change were to be seen in the district; Thurloe Square was just built and Brompton Square, where some of the Hanoverian favourites had lived, was close by the proposed purchase. None the less, the Fathers must have felt a qualm as they looked round the country scene of orchards and dairy farms, the tea-gardens of the Admiral Keppel and the fields behind the new Parish Church. However, they swallowed their doubts and took the plunge, securing thus a magnificent site in the middle of an area which, in forty years, was to be as much a part of London as the Strand itself had been.

While waiting for new buildings at Brompton, the Fathers continued their work in the Strand district, and dealt with ever-increasing inquiries and requests for help and advice. Faber, even at this date, had an immense number of private correspondents, to all of whom he replied with a thoroughness as impressive as his forthrightness. At the end of one long and devastating letter to a woman who had sent him a very self-centred journal, from which she expected him to decide that she had a religious vocation, he writes, "I have a trick of writing honestly, where the soul is concerned; and I shall not think the

worse of you if you are angry with me nor the better of you if you take it well. May God and our Dear Lady bless you, and make you *real*! P.S. I will forward your journal if you will tell me how to do so—would it not be better to send me an order to burn it?"

Wiseman had already appealed to Faber for help in work which might take the Oratory beyond a strict interpretation of their rule, in view of the extreme shortage of clergy. Faber promised to undertake whatever the Cardinal asked. Wiseman welcomed this loyal response and promised that, desperately short of priests as he was, he would never place the smallest obstacle in the way of any one of them who might wish to join the Oratory. He also asked the community to take on a parish in due course at Brompton, though nothing was settled about it until 1856, when a large area was made into the Oratory Parish.

Before this, however, a determined attempt was made by the authorities of the Parish Church to oust this unwelcome cuckoo in their nest. The new University of Art and Industry—admirable and solid symbol of the ideas of the period—was about to be erected in the neighbourhood with the profits from the Great Exhibition. And here, cheek by jowl with this holy of holies of the new Jerusalem, the Baal-like priests of reaction and darkness were about to erect a grove of Romanism. It was not to be endured, and forceful appeals were made to Palmerston and Lord John Russell to purchase their site compulsorily for Government use. Alas, no funds were available, replied these most Protestant but also most cautious ministers, and so, despite all efforts, the pollution of South Kensington took place and right in front of the Waterloo sham-Gothic of the Parish Church rose up a building even uglier than itself. It was simply a brick tunnel, badly lit and ventilated, which was to serve until funds could be raised for a permanent church. Beside it appeared the house, library and Oratory, completed in 1854, and looking almost exactly as they do now.

Hideous as the church was from the outside, it soon became all glorious within. The service-list has continued to this day almost unchanged, with High Mass and Vespers on Sundays and on all great feasts, frequent daily Masses and a special service for every night of the week, with devotions to the

Precious Blood, St Philip, the Seven Dolours, the Blessed Sacrament and the Stations of the Cross. A mission was held to mark the formation of the parish; it was dedicated to the martyr St Eutropius, whose body, brought from the catacombs, lies now under an altar in the church. An instruction was given every morning at seven o'clock followed by Mass, while in the evening two addresses were divided by a hymn. Cardinal Wiseman himself opened the mission, and preached for an hour.

The various works of the Fathers among the poor—schools, refuges, orphanages and suchlike—could never have flourished without the help of a religious community of women. This help had been provided at King William Street by the Sisters of Compassion. When the move to Brompton was made, the Sisters, so close was their connexion with the Oratory, moved also. Their house in Cale Street, St Wilfrid's Convent, had been built by two elderly ladies, the Misses Nutt, devoted supporters of the Oratory, so that the works of charity should not suffer by their transfer from the Strand. What followed was an object lesson to those who affect to despise legal details in their admiration of warm-hearted charity. A deed of trusteeship was made for the Convent of a complicated and unworkable nature, which was never properly examined by the authorities of either the Convent or the Oratory, who were the two parties chiefly concerned. For some years everything went swimmingly; then one day a question arose over some alterations being made at the Convent. The Misses Nutt, thinking that their foundation was being unwarrantably interfered with, complained to Father Knox, then Superior of the Oratory. He replied that it was nothing to do with him, to which they retorted that he was the principal trustee. The title deeds were examined for the first time by both himself and Mother Philomena, Superior of the Convent, and both were equally dismayed to find that the Misses Nutt were right. The upshot of the affair was that the Sisters, feeling their independence jeopardized, left the Convent "bag and baggage" in the middle of August 1867.

After various negotiations it was agreed between the Fathers and the Congregation of the Daughters of the Cross at

Liège that they should take on the Convent and buy it outright, so that an end might be made of ambiguous and trouble-making trusteeships. The whole arrangement was nearly wrecked by the shady and highly unprofessional behaviour of the solicitor in charge of the sale, who, against his instruction, accepted a bid from "an unknown Catholic gentleman" representing a religious order.

The disentanglement of this fresh complication taxed both the patience and the diplomacy of Father Knox, but in the end he succeeded. The Daughters of the Cross took possession of the building and the chapter of accidents was thus happily concluded, for they have remained ever since, and teach in all the Oratory schools as well as the Sunday Schools.

The Fathers felt now that they had reached a permanent site, and they began a process of consolidation. The revivalist atmosphere in which their early years had been spent now gave place to a steadier, less agitated tempo of life, more suitable to the true nature of the Oratory, whose manner of approach, after the example of St Philip, is *suaviter* rather than *fortiter*. Their work now was in two directions: that of the parish and that of the eclectic congregation, which came to the Oratory from all parts of London and elsewhere.

The work of the Fathers among non-Catholics had from the first been an important side of their vocation. The great majority of them were converts, and so they have been ever since. The understanding and sympathy which they were able to show to those who found Protestantism inadequate, or to the increasing numbers of people who had cast loose from any religious moorings whatever, led many to them who might otherwise have feared speaking to a Catholic priest. While they maintained to the full the Roman splendour of their services, the Fathers held to a directness and simplicity of manner towards the many inquirers who tended to look nervously over their shoulders for unknown terrors even after summoning up the courage to ask for an interview. The background of an English public school and University, in many cases supplemented by a period of time as a clergyman, was invaluable in breaking the ice and establishing confidence.

Naturally this work was not carried on without opposition,

particularly when young men and women of Protestant families were received into the Church. The Fathers were freely accused of luring young persons of fortune into the house, which, it was said, was expressly constructed for the purposes of concealment. Once there, it seems, the victims were compelled to disgorge their wealth, in the name of religion, after which they were murdered and their bodies conveyed to a secret burial-ground under false names. One stout Protestant named Smee, who had married the sister of one of the Fathers, was so disappointed at finding himself and his family passed over in favour of the Oratory in the said Father's will that he raised questions in Parliament about it, wrote many letters of inordinate length to the daily papers and published a highly coloured and entertaining tract entitled "The Secret Burial-Ground of the Brompton Jesuits". The ensuing law-suit revealed a more sensible and impartial attitude to the Catholic side than Lord Campbell's notorious judgment against Dr Newman at the Achilli trial in 1852, while even *Punch* dismissed the absurdity of the accusations by the neat couplet:

"Mr. Smee,
Fiddle-de-dec!"

After the formation of the parish the work of the Oratory went on in quiet, unspectacular fashion for the most part until 1863, in which year Faber died at the early age of forty-nine. It was a turning-point in the history of the house; while Faber was alive his personality, his genius, had so informed the life of the house that everyone thought of him as soon as the London Oratory was mentioned. To a large extent it was a one-man show, which probably explained why the place got into its stride so quickly, for although the "democratic" forms inalienable from a Philippine community were always religiously observed, it was none the less true that things were done as Faber intended them to be done—his personal ascendancy was so great that it seldom occurred to the other Fathers to propose any line of action other than that suggested by him. He had an instinctive grasp of a situation, together with quickness in decision, which meant that he had everything cut and dried before anyone else had really arrived at any conclusion at all. He was a born

leader, and his brethren were content that he should lead them through that vital initial period when the besieged became the besiegers and defence turned to attack. Like all great leaders, Faber was a single-minded man. His one aim was to open the eyes of his fellow-Englishmen to the truth and splendour of the Catholic religion, to the joy of living in intimate association with Jesus and Mary, with Philip and the rest of the Church triumphant. To this end he preached fervidly and frequently and poured out that flood of hymns and spiritual writing which, inevitably, contains much that is weak and even ludicrous for us today, but which also holds much that is as valuable and effective now as it undoubtedly was then. Father Faber was perfectly a man of his own day and for us that day has had a laughable quality because it was simpler and more ingenuous both in its gravity and in its levity. We laugh less loudly today, however, than we did twenty years ago and perhaps presently we may even decide that there is more to be said for its simplicity than we have been willing to admit. Of one thing there is no doubt—without Faber the great Church of the London Oratory would not be standing in Brompton Road at this moment, for none but he had the driving force, the determination, as well as the real sanctity and ascetic power, to launch the new venture on so perilous a sea.

The framework of Catholic life in London was, by 1870, much more fixed than it had been twenty years before. The Oratory was by now firmly established within this framework, the persistent good sense and charity of the Fathers had to a large extent overcome the more violent opposition, and with a regular congregation and a settled round of duties they felt that the time had come to give permanent and splendid expression to that *Romanità* which had been so notable a feature of their method. The Church, beloved as it was, was still only a temporary building, and nothing could make its exterior less ugly. It was time to build a *Chiesa Nuova* in London. When one recalls the type of building which was everywhere in England being erected at this period it seems astonishing that the Fathers should have so firmly insisted on one which should be wholly in the Italian Renaissance style. We may well bless their devotion to the Roman manner, for it probably saved London from yet

another post-Pugin eyesore. In the event, an attractive design by Herbert Gribble was adopted, and a fine, spacious building, inspired by the style required, but not slavishly modelled on it, began to rise on the site of the brick abomination which had been speedily demolished. Portland stone for the exterior, Devonshire marble for the internal columns, were the principal materials. A sanctuary floor of rare and precious woods had already been given to the temporary church by the Dowager Duchess of Argyll. This remained in the new structure and was completed by altar-rails of Sienese marble with gilt bronze doors and a fine high altar of gilt and white marble. A magnificent late-Baroque altar from a secularized church in Brescia was brought over to form the Lady Altar. Its wonderful intarsio marble and lapis-lazuli decorations, together with its splendid statuary, make it a work of art of the first order. A set of gigantic Baroque statues of the Apostles which had previously been in Siena cathedral, but were removed thence as being unsuited to the Gothic style of that building, were later acquired and erected in the church. There are several side chapels with fine marble entablatures, while polychrome marble and mosaic decoration have at various times been added to the interior, until it finally achieved the wholly Italian effect which it now gives. The well-proportioned sacristy houses an unusually fine collection of vestments and a few sumptuous pieces of church plate, as well as a number of gay gilt cherubs who make their appearance on occasions when the church is adorned for a great feast.

The musical tradition of the Oratory has continued on a high level. In recent years the great Renaissance composers, Palestrina, Byrd, Victoria, Lassus' and others have largely replaced the later and more operatic musicians.

The development of the parish continued side by side with the more specialized work of the Fathers, and in particular a complete school system was built up which today serves not only the parish but a large area of London, through the London Oratory schools (Central Schools, as they were formerly called) for boys and girls.

After the new church had been opened in 1884—the present dome was added some time later—the Oratory settled down to fulfil that peculiar rôle which should properly belong to it.

If an Oratorian is asked, as he often is, what is the specific object of his congregation, he is apt to be a little embarrassed. It is true that the threefold activity of Prayer, Preaching and Administration of the Sacraments is, according to the Rule of the founder, St Philip Neri, the primary purpose of the Institute. They discharge also, in varying degrees, the functions common to all the clergy, and the inquirer will often ask, when given this answer, whether there be no note or mark which will distinguish the Oratorian from his fellow priest. In one sense there is not, for the Fathers are not Religious; they take no vows other than those involved in the priesthood, they have no bond but that of charity, and though they live in community under rule, yet they are free to leave the house at any time with no more ado than if they were going on holiday. The Community life, however, does provide a specific difference, for it confers stability; it is the mark of an Oratorian that he is always in the same place, his *métier* is permanence.

It has been said of a London club that its peculiar attraction is the fact that when one returns to it after ten years spent in exploring the Amazon or shooting tigers in Sumatra, the porter is standing in exactly the same place, he gives one the same polite, unsurprised "Good morning, sir"; one receives the same unparticularized courtesy from the head waiter in the dining-room, so that, before long, one begins to wonder whether one has really been away at all. It is the ideal of the Catholic Church that people should feel that, whether they last entered a church yesterday or ten years ago, their needs will be attended to with the same politeness, attention and absence of surprise.

It has been the rôle of the Oratory to provide, by its stability and continuity, an intense and striking expression of this availability of the clergy in the service of Christian people; the common life under St Philip's rule has enabled the Fathers of the Oratory to fulfil more thoroughly and obviously the basic activities of the Priesthood. "Oh, let's go to the Oratory, you can always get hold of someone there." Such a remark is not infrequently heard, particularly perhaps among the younger and less respectful of the laity. For the Fathers, it is both a tribute and a challenge.

PATRICK BUSHELL

SHARING IN THE SACRIFICE

NEARLY two years ago the Holy Father issued his wonderful Encyclical *Mediator Dei*, of which the greater part is concerned with the need for promoting a better understanding and closer participation on the part of the laity in the Mass. "The liturgy, in an external manner also, should be a holy action in which all who are present take part."

There are various items of external participation commended, and there are some people in this country who are trying to do something about some of them. But there is one concerning which nothing seems to be done; nobody seems to be pleading for it. Yet the Holy Father's words are particularly clear and forceful; and that which he urges could be of outstanding value in engendering that internal participation of the mind and will which is the ultimate object of all external participation. For, more than any other recommendation, it expresses in action that which is of the very essence of lay-participation in the Mass.

For what is the Mass?—it is a sacrifice, something done by a community, a particular form of gift-giving. The members of a community offer to God some external gift in token of self-oblation. This is completed by the reception of God's return-gift. Hence the community is concerned with offering and receiving; and through these actions (offertory, communion) tries to establish a bond between itself and God.

The sacrifices of the Old Testament were inadequate because no one belonging to the community could make the gift worthy of God's acceptance. But the sacrifice of the New Testament is adequate because one member of the community—Christ, its Head—possesses and exercises the power needed to turn the community's gift into that very same gift, perfectly worthy of God's acceptance, which He Himself offered on Calvary. (This He does through a human minister, the priest, in the consecration.)

The old sacrifices, consisting only of man's activity in offering and communicating, never achieved their purpose. The New Sacrifice, consisting of the activity of man in offering and

receiving, *plus* the activity of the God-man (through His human minister) in consecrating, *does* achieve its purpose. It gives to God the Father "through Him (Christ our Head) and with Him and in Him all honour and glory".

Man's part in this consists essentially in offering; ideally also in receiving. But in the Mass as we have it now, there is no external action of the people which perfectly expresses either of their functions of giving the sacrificial gift or of receiving the sacrificial victim. If only both of these were perfectly expressed in external action, the people would more easily evoke and be conscious of perfectly corresponding acts of mind and will in which their participation essentially consists.

There are, of course, actions expressive of giving and of receiving; but both are imperfect expressions. The people put money on the plate. This expresses giving. But they do not do this on week-days, so it is not part of each Mass. Moreover, even on Sundays, it does not make a man feel "I am giving a share of the bread and wine of *this* Mass." Only if he reflects does he realize that the bread and wine for *this* Mass which he is *now* offering were purchased with money which he gave at some other, previous, Mass. The symbolism fails, one might say, through lack of immediacy. There is no direct connexion between the coin that he contributes now and the sacrifice he offers now.

And when it comes to receiving Communion there is even less direct connexion. He receives a host from a ciborium out of the tabernacle, not consecrated at *THIS* Mass which he is *now* offering. He is not partaking directly of *THIS* sacrifice, but of some previous sacrifice at which perhaps he was not even present as co-offerer. Again, on reflection, he will realize that there is a fundamental unity about all Masses in that each Mass is a re-enactment of the *ONE* sacrifice of Calvary. So there is a sense in which he does participate, even in this sacrifice, when he receives a host consecrated at some other. But it is not an immediate and direct participation such as it would be if he received a host which he had himself presented.

This is the point which the Holy Father makes when (in §126) he praises "the piety of those who not only desire to be nourished with the heavenly food when they are present at the

Sacrifice, but prefer to be fed with hosts consecrated at the same sacrifice". He is surprisingly insistent, and quotes a very forcible passage from Benedict XIV: "The Church has not forbidden in the past and does not now forbid the priest to satisfy the devotion and the just request of those who assist at Mass and wish to participate in that same sacrifice which they themselves have also offered; moreover she approves of this and desires that it be not omitted." (The Latin is here "vult ne id omittatur.") "And she reproves those priests by whose fault or negligence this participation is denied to the faithful." Hardly could Papal words be clearer, stronger, or more emphatic! And later in the Encyclical (in §128) the Pope returns to the same point yet again: "Those are to be praised who, assisting at Mass, receive the hosts consecrated at that same sacrifice, so that it becomes true that 'as many of us as have received the Body and Blood of Thy Son by partaking of this altar, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace'."

Who in England, consciously and of set purpose, tries to carry out this papal desire expressed nearly two years ago? Is anybody doing anything about it? It happens sometimes, as if by accident, when Mass is offered at some altar where there is no tabernacle. Then sufficient hosts for the intending communicants are consecrated on the paten, thus bringing it about that the faithful then do "participate in that same sacrifice which they themselves have offered". Yet this is not regarded as "the ideal thing to do"; rather it is thought of as a makeshift necessitated by lack of a tabernacle. Whereas we see from the Pope's teaching that it is the ideal; it is for this we should strive; it ought to be the normal procedure at every Mass. And if we do not seek ways and means of making it the normal procedure, sincerely trying to overcome practical difficulties, then we are not following the Pope's lead. If what the Holy Father has written is going to have no effect whatever, he will have written in vain. The fact that he did write it shows that he intends it to have some effect.

There are, of course, practical difficulties. The Pope himself admits it, in the next paragraph. "Nevertheless reasons frequently do occur for distributing Holy Communion . . . with hosts previously consecrated." But let us note well and ponder

earnestly his qualifying remarks which follow the admission. "But while the Church," he says, "makes concessions in her motherly desire to meet the spiritual needs of her children, these on their part must do all in their power to conform to what the liturgy recommends, and, unless there is some reasonable cause to the contrary, do everything that may clearly manifest at the altar the living unity of the Mystical Body."

So there are two possibilities: either we adhere to the present practice of distributing Communion from pre-consecrated ciboria (which means persisting in something the Pope does not want), or we earnestly seek for ways and means to do—at least whenever we can—what His Holiness desires, even at the cost of upsetting present practice. Surely, as loyal sons of the Holy Father, our course is the latter?

We priests are pledged, then, to "do all in our power to conform to what the liturgy recommends"; we must do our utmost to "satisfy the devotion and just request of those who assist at Mass and wish to participate in that same sacrifice which they themselves have offered". We must remind ourselves that the Church "desires that this be not omitted". We must see to it that we are not "priests by whose fault or negligence this participation is denied to the faithful". But it *will* be denied if we do nothing about it: and it will be by our *negligence* if, to save ourselves the trouble of changing our ways, we hush this matter up, refuse to face the question, sedulously avoid awaking in the minds of the faithful that "devotion" which might issue in the "just request" that we consecrate for them at the Mass they are offering the hosts which they are to receive thereat. We cannot dismiss the whole matter by saying that practical difficulties stand in the way. Admittedly they do, sometimes. But to maintain that consecrating for the laity at each Mass is always impracticable or even usually impracticable is to accuse the Holy Father of advocating an absurdity. It *must* be possible on a great many occasions, or he would not have urged it.

It seems to me that we must distinguish between Sunday Masses, when many are present, and weekday Masses when few are present. The practical problems in the two cases are quite different, and we shall never solve the former till we have first

solved the latter. So in this article I do not propose to discuss the case of the "big congregation", but only that of the small one.

For the small congregation there is, as a matter of fact, an easy solution, though, for reasons which follow, I hold that it is not satisfactory. The solution is that the priest, when turning round for the *Dominus vobiscum* which follows the Gospel, can note that there are five, or eight, or ten present (as the case may be). He can then offer, and later consecrate, five, or eight, or ten small hosts on the paten. (If, at the Communion, less than that number are received by the laity, he could consume the remaining two or three himself, or add them to those in the tabernacle for consumption next Sunday.) Alternatively the server, during the Gospel, could go to the people and "catch the eye" of each person present, determining from their nods how many will be at Communion; then, before bringing the cruets to the priest, he proffers a box of small hosts saying "five", or "eight" or "ten", as the case may be.

There is no difficulty about this, and I maintain that if no better solution is found we ought *at least* to do this, as a normal procedure, and completely discontinue the practice of giving Holy Communion from a pre-consecrated ciborium at all "small" Masses. In view of the strong wording of the Encyclical it is the minimum we can do.

But now I want to go further, and urge that this "minimum" solution is not adequate. Certainly it is simple and it is practicable: but it seems to me that it fulfils the Pope's desires only as regards the letter. It hardly achieves his purpose, which is "to make it more evident that by receiving Holy Communion the faithful take part in the sacrifice" (§126). The procedure described would be little use in "making it more evident", for it hardly implies anything to the people: it would *mean* nothing to them. Even if the meaning be explained it would not "go home" to them. For the meaning which matters, the meaning of which their minds should become vividly conscious, is that *they offer* the hosts which they are to receive. It is not just that they receive (they can do that from a ciborium); it is that they receive *what they have offered*.

Now it is true that if the priest puts hosts on his paten after estimating the number of communicants, the people do *de facto* offer these hosts because it is "his sacrifice and theirs". But his putting hosts on to the paten without any action of theirs in no way helps them to realize this. If they nod at the server when he comes round they do at least do something, which is better than nothing. But it is very little better—because nodding is not an action expressive of offering. Considered as a means for making them realize what the Pope wants them to realize, it is feeble in the extreme. It would, indeed, fulfil the letter of the Holy Father's directive (and that is why I maintain we ought to do it if we cannot do anything better); but would it fulfil the spirit? While it is not actually pointless, the point is hardly to be seen by the people.

There is, however, a way in which the point is vividly seen, a way in which it can be brought home to the people clearly and forcibly that they offer; and that *what* they offer, *that* they receive. That way is an Offertory procession; and I submit that the arguments in favour of its restoration receive fresh support from the Encyclical *Mediator Dei*. For it is a complete answer to all the points raised by the passages from the Encyclical discussed hitherto; in fact I hold that these passages do, so to speak, "adumbrate" it. And the Holy Father reminds us—in §94—that one of the proofs that the faithful are offering the sacrifice is "the fact that sometimes—in ancient days more frequently—they present bread and wine to the sacred ministers in order that they may become the Body and Blood of Christ".

Also it is not without significance that an argument commonly advanced against restoration of the Offertory procession receives no support from the Encyclical. Opponents say it is an archaeologism. (This is constantly brought up against any proposed change if the thing proposed was done in past days. But if it was not done in past days, then the thing proposed is denounced as an innovation. But every change falls under one heading or the other. Either it was done in the past or it was not. So every change can be resisted either as an archaeologism or an innovation. "Heads I win; tails you lose." Convenient—but not convincing!) But is the Offertory procession a mere

archaeologism? Yes, "if it is considered better . . . just because it has the flavour of antiquity" (§65). Yes, if it were advocated merely from "a desire to restore everything indiscriminately to its ancient condition" (§66). But these are not the reasons for advocating it. The reasons are the instruction of the faithful, the good of souls, and its aptness for fulfilling the Holy Father's desire that the laity should receive hosts they have themselves offered.

In §63 the Pope denounces unauthorized innovations; in §66 he denounces undesirable archaeologisms. But in neither list of examples which he gives does the Offertory procession appear. Yet it is widely advocated by liturgical writers; and not only is it advocated but, in various forms, it is quite frequently practised. If it were an abuse, it would certainly have been denounced.

This in itself is a suasive argument against those who are of the opinion that the introduction of an Offertory procession is in conflict with existing rubrics. Replies to questions sent up to the Sacred Congregation of Rites have never forbidden the Offertory procession as such, but only disapproved of certain methods of carrying it out. For instance, in 1883 the S.C.R. forbade the celebrant to say to each offerer "*Oblatio tua accepta sit a Deo*"; and in 1945 it forbade the offerers to recite with the priest the offertory prayers. But the Offertory procession—obviously in some acceptable form—was done under the very eyes, as it were, of the S.C.R. in Rome itself, at the Basilica of the Twelve Apostles in the following year.

Moreover it has been introduced in all sorts of other places in various forms, sometimes with Cardinals and Bishops in the role of celebrant. Cardinals Suhard, Faulhaber and Innitzer may be instanced in Europe, and Cardinal Stritch in America. A long list could be compiled of Bishops, both European and American.

Liturgical writers who plead for the Offertory procession are very numerous. A few samples may be of interest.

Dr Pius Parsch, of Klosterneuburg, wrote in his book *Volksliturgie*¹:

¹ Vienna, 1940. 3p. 55, here translated.

At present the offertory has degenerated into a merely sacerdotal activity. But the old liturgical texts of the offertory and the secret presuppose that the people have done their part in an offertory procession . . . If we allow the Liturgy to speak for itself we see that the procession is no mere "side-show" but something pertaining to the very essence of the first part of the sacrificial action . . . I would like to add that it is precisely this procession, this actual going up of the people to the altar of sacrifice, which is most expressive of meaning. It brings out the dramatic element of the Mass: it is the visible expression of "putting oneself into the sacrifice"; it is really active participation; it is an exercise and expression of the priesthood of the laity. From the point of view of active participation it is vital that the Offertory procession be cultivated and encouraged.

The Offertory procession has two forms: a procession with hosts, or a procession with charitable gifts. The former is undoubtedly more full of symbolism, more explicit in its expression, more beautiful: "I give my bread and I receive it back consecrated" . . . At St Gertrude's here, we have both kinds of procession.

In the Proceedings of the American National Liturgical Week, 1941, is an account of a speech by Fr Laukemper of Chicago:

We must succeed in making our people altar- or sacrifice-conscious, and get them away from Tabernacle-consciousness. The serious defect is that Holy Communion is considered in regard to the Tabernacle rather than in regard to the Sacrifice. That defect can be corrected. The important part in the sacrifice is the offertory and the conscious sharing of the people in that offertory. Some way must be found that is acceptable and practical to show this. My way may not be acceptable to all, and some may not think it practical, but we have a Sunday Offertory procession regularly, and our people carry hosts to the altar rail as an expression of their individual and collective self-oblation. That gift must be symbolic, and hence the procession to the altar is of great importance.

At the National Liturgical Week of 1943, Fr Morell of Wichita, Kansas, said:

Our most reverend Ordinary, Bishop Winkelmann, has given a great deal of encouragement to the observance of the Offertory procession, so that it is now a quite common and even daily practice in some of our school chapels, and even in some parishes on certain days.

The Abbé Michonneau has a description of Nuptial Masses in his parish of Colombes¹:

Experience shows that friends of the young couple are more than willing to say prayers with them, and the custom of receiving Communion at the Wedding Mass is becoming more common. In such cases the bride and groom bring up the host and the wine, while each of the other participants brings a small host.

Now if the Offertory procession as such were incompatible with existing rubrics, or forbidden by the S.C.R., such writings and such practices would have been stamped out long ago, and no Cardinals or Bishops would have tolerated them, let alone taken part in them. Whence I argue that the Offertory procession is not forbidden by the rubrics; all that matters is that it shall be done in some form which has episcopal approval.

And I plead, further, that we in England ought not so to lag behind France and Germany and Austria and Holland and Belgium and America in this matter. The Offertory procession is practically unknown amongst us; I have not heard of any consistent fostering of it except by Y.C.W. chaplains at Masses for their own members. And yet if some procedure could be agreed on, and authoritative direction obtained from the Hierarchy, much could be done to help the faithful, at least on special occasions and at "small Masses", to realize the share which is properly theirs in the offering of the Holy Sacrifice.

Here is a method which, I submit, does violence to no rubrics, for it makes no difference to the priest's actions at Mass. On a small table at the sanctuary gates, let there be a tray on which rests an empty ciborium, a box of small hosts, a pair of sugar-tongs or forceps, and the cruets. While the priest is reading the Offertory verse, intending communicants could

¹ *Revolution in a City Parish*, p. 38.

approach the table, and each would transfer a host from box to ciborium. The server bears the tray to the celebrant who takes from it the ciborium and puts in on the corporal, then carrying on with the "Suscipe" in the usual manner. The server puts the tray on to the credence table, and then brings the cruets up in the normal way. An experiment has shown that fifteen people can do their host-transference in sixty seconds. It will be noticed that the priest does not have to leave the altar, or turn round, or wait more than a few seconds, or do anything contrary to the rubrics.

But, as a result, the wish of the Holy Father that the people should communicate from hosts they themselves have offered, would be carried out to the letter.

Moreover, it would be carried out in the spirit too. It would in fact "make it more evident that by receiving Holy Communion the people take part in the sacrifice" (§126). They would be conscious, as never before, that they are partaking of the very sacrifice which they themselves have helped to offer. For the ciborium has been filled *by them*, and sent *by them*, together with the cruets, up to the altar; and now this same ciborium, containing the Victim of their sacrifice, is emptied by distribution *to them* of the hosts which represent the gift of themselves to God. It would deepen their understanding and appreciation of the Mass more than any other form of external participation.

The method would be entirely practicable—and enormously appreciated—in convents where the community is not large. It could be done in seminaries and boarding schools, even with large numbers, on special occasions such as during retreats. It could be done at week-day parish Masses when few attend (though not in large parishes where week-day attendance is more numerous). It could not be done in this form at Sunday Masses, though First Communicants might very well be allowed to do it in the presence of numbers.

If Offertory processions (whether in this or in some other form) could become common at "small Masses" then, in the course of time, the idea would become familiar to the majority of the faithful; and some day the Hierarchy might judge that the time has come for the introduction, in some form yet to be

thought out, of Offertory processions even at Sunday Masses with large congregations.

Then at last the people would have some action really expressive of their giving—and, moreover, of their giving in *this* very sacrifice which they themselves are helping to offer. Constant repetition of the action would bring home to them more than any number of verbal explanations the privilege which is truly theirs of being genuine offerers, with their priest, of the Holy Sacrifice which is “the summit and the centre of the Christian religion” (§70).

CLIFFORD HOWELL, S.J.

A WHALLEY MARTYR¹

WHEN Dr Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon and Vicar Apostolic, sent his Catalogue of the English Martyrs to Rome in 1628 he stated, among other things, that the Venerable John Thules was a native of Whalley.² The importance of the Bishop's statement on this question of the Martyr's birthplace has not been fully appreciated. Bishop Challoner, for some reason or other, when he came to write his *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, said in his account that the Venerable John Thules “was born in Lancashire at a place called Upholland”.³ And almost every writer since has been content to follow him. Thus, Gasquet,⁴ Foley,⁵ Gillow,⁶ and the Editors of the Victoria County History of Lancashire,⁷ to mention but the most important. Two recent Vice-Postulators, however, raised the doubt;

¹ Venerable John Thules, Thewlis or Hulas, H.D.Q. at Lancaster, 18 March, 1616.

² West. Arch. Cat. MM.

³ *Memoirs*, 1924 ed., p. 342.

⁴ Hist. of Ven. Eng. Coll., p. 141.

⁵ Records, vi, 181.

⁶ Cf. C.T.S., B.158. “An Upholland Martyr.”

⁷ V.C.H., Lancs., iv, 94.

for both Father Pollen¹ and Father Newdigate² in their lists of the Martyrs gave the Martyr's birthplace "either at Whalley or at Upholland". Even they, however, were not sure, and being busy with bigger things, left the question still unsettled.

In the opinion of the present writer the question is worth settling, not merely as any other historical fact about the Martyrs is worth settling, but because until it is settled the Venerable John Thules is in a real sense "nobody's Martyr" and local devotion to him with prayers for his Cause must be harder to obtain.

The two authorities for his birthplace are undoubtedly the two Bishops, Smith and Challoner. All other writers base their own opinions on them. So the question to decide is simply which of these two is right. And as the current opinion, almost universal, is with Challoner, let us examine his case first.

Challoner does not give any explicit authority for his statement that our Martyr was born at Upholland. He does, however, give two authorities for his general account of the Martyr, and either, or both, of these may include the place of birth. The first is "a printed account of their martyrdom, published at Douay in 1617". The second is "a Manuscript in my hands".³

What the former is it is easy to determine, and the work survives in several differing editions. It is an account first edited in 1616 by Dr Matthew Kellison, then President of Douay, of the four Douay Martyrs of that year—Bd. Thomas Maxfield, Bd. Thomas Tunstal, Ven. Thomas Atkinson, and the Venerable John Thules (with the Ven. Roger Wrennal who suffered with him). The first edition of this work was printed in Latin in 1616 by Pierre Auroy at the Pelican Press at Douay. A copy may be found at the Bibliotheca Vallicelliana in Rome.⁴ The following year a more complete Latin edition was printed at the same press in Douay, then named on the title-page the Golden Pelican. It bore the same title: "EXEMPLAR | LITERARVM | A

¹ The Ven. Mart. of Eng., p. 30.

² C.T.S., H.163. "Our Martyrs", p. 27; "b. Upholland (or perhaps Whalley), Lancs."

³ Memoirs, p. 342.

⁴ This edition does not seem to have been known to Father Pollen, at least when he wrote the note in C.R.S. iii, 30. But I examined a transcript of it some years ago. It omits a few lines from the account of the Ven. Thomas Atkinson and about half the chapter on Thules, as compared with the edition of 1617.

QVODAM SACERDOTE | COLLEGII ANGLORVM | DVACENI | QVON-
 DAM ALVMNO | EX ANGLIA AD IDEM | COLLEGIVM TRANS- |
 MISSARVM. | DE MARTYRIIS | QVATVOR EIVSDEM COLLEGII |
 ALVMNORVM OB SA- | CERDOTIVM HOC ANNO 1616. | IN ANGLIA
 MORTE | DAMNATORVM. | . . . DVACI, | Typis PETRI AVROI,
 sub Pelicano | aureo, Anno M.DC.XVII." A copy of this
 second Latin edition, which no doubt is the text used by
 Challoner, may be found in the British Museum bound with
 another tract, "Nuntius a Mortuis", under the title "Tract.
 Hist. 1617."¹ Shortly after this, though the exact date is not
 known, an edition was published in French: "Jouxte la coppie
 Imprimee. A DOVAY, Chez PIERRE avroy, au Pelican d'or.
 1616." A copy of this edition (by far the best of all²) entitled
 "COPPIE | D'VNE LETTRE | ENVOYEE D'ANGLETERRE | au Semin-
 aire des Anglois | à Douay . . ." etc., may be found in the
 British Museum,³ as well as a further copy of a very incomplete
 Paris edition of 1618 of only fourteen pages, under the title
 "HISTOIRE | VERITABLE | DV MARTYRE DE | QVATRE PRESTRES
 DV | COLLEGE DE DOVAY | . . ." etc.⁴

But in none of these editions is there any mention that the
 Venerable John Thules was a native of Upholland.

We are now left to consider the "manuscript in my hands",
 and may presume that any reference to Upholland will be found
 in this. Whether that is so in fact cannot be stated with cer-
 tainty, for unfortunately the present whereabouts of this manu-
 script is not known. But in searching for it an interesting fact
 was discovered, which may well explain how the reference to
 Upholland (whether in the manuscript or not) found its way
 into Challoner's narrative. In 1932 Brigadier T. B. Trappes-
 Lomax⁵ asked the authorities at Oscott to look for the "manu-
 script in my hands" among the Challoner-Butler papers pre-
 served at the College. These papers comprise the materials
 which Challoner used when compiling his *Memoirs of Missionary*

¹ Brit. Mus. 1126. a. 2.

² It is much more carefully edited and more complete, particularly regarding
 the catalogue printed at the end of the book. Many names omitted in the 1617 ed.
 are supplied, e.g. Campion, Shert, Lacy, etc. It consists of 63 pp.

³ Brit. Mus. 1368. c. 3, the second in a volume entitled "Tracts. 1604. 1628."

⁴ Op. cit., the third in the same volume.

⁵ I am grateful to Brigadier Trappes-Lomax for this information. Much else in
 this article was also worked upon by him independently of myself.

Priests; so that it is naturally among these MSS. that one would most expect to find the "manuscript in my hands".¹ The Rev. L. W. Jones replied that all he could find among Challoner's papers was an account beginning "He is said to have been born at Up-holland in Lancashire". This account is a rough draft of a life of Thules used by Challoner, altered somewhat, and then crossed out with a vertical line indicating that it was finished with. It begins with practically the same words as the account in Challoner's *Memoirs*, with the important exception (for our purpose) that the qualified assertion "he is said to have been born at Upholland" has by now become quite definite.²

Whatever one thinks about the "manuscript in my hands", there does not seem to be any independent evidence in favour of Challoner's view. The Upholland Parish Registers,³ as far as baptisms go, start only in 1607 and are consequently useless for our purpose. Nor do they throw any light on the family even at a later date. And this ends the case for Upholland.

When we consider the case for Whalley our approach must be somewhat different. Bishop Smith really gives no authority at all for his statement about the Martyr's birthplace. Nevertheless he does give us the one necessary clue to a new line of enquiry when he says that the Venerable John Thules was "natus apud Whalley in comitatu Lancastriae . . .",⁴ and directed by this clue we are able to find independent evidence to support him.

But before going on to this it ought to be insisted that Smith is himself the greatest authority on the Martyrs' birthplaces generally—greater even than Challoner, who came later than he did and who was helped by much of his work. A comparison of the lists of birthplaces drawn up by Smith, Challoner and

¹ A similar, though not identical, collection of MSS. is preserved at Westminster. It represents, in fact, the original documents from which Butler actually made his transcripts for Challoner. The individual papers from this collection have, however, been separated and placed chronologically among other materials in the archives. I looked through this only as thoroughly as time would allow, but found nothing which could have been the "manuscript in my hands".

² One is tempted to think that the rough draft used by Challoner is actually the "manuscript in my hands". But against this it must be said that Challoner in his "Memoirs" adds another fact to the life of Thules from some other source than *Exemplar Literarum*, viz. that Mr Ashton of Lever was Thules' godson. This fact is not in the rough draft. So Challoner had another source besides, which one ought to presume, unless there is contrary evidence, is the "manuscript in my hands". The rough draft begins on p. 482 and continues on p. 485.

³ L.P.R.S., 23.

⁴ West. Arch. Cat. MM.

Father Newdigate (in the most recent list of all) is illuminating. The truth is that Bishop Smith was forced by a kind of accident to go deeply into the question, and did so with remarkable accuracy while contemporary evidence was still available. The Bishop was commissioned by Rome to collect information about the Martyrs, and the correspondence which preceded the sending of his famous Catalogue in 1628 tells us how he had found most difficulty of all in settling this very question of birthplaces.¹ It can be understood how much easier it was to find details of a Martyr's death, which had occurred only recently and had been made very public, than to find details of his birth, much earlier and much more obscure. The Bishop had his Catalogue ready by 1626, except for the birthplaces; and would have sent it then, as it was, had Rome been willing to omit them. But a delay there had to be, and a further two years of inquiries elapsed before despatch. During those years the Bishop made certain of the birthplace of Thules.

The obvious step for us now is to see if the Parish Registers of Whalley can help us. And here we are encouraged from the start by the fact that they are among the oldest in the county,² beginning in late 1538 for baptisms and burials and only a few weeks later, in 1539, for marriages. But although they have been reprinted and are easy of access no one seems to have taken this step. Perhaps an unfortunate letter to the writer of *An Upholland Martyr* dissuaded many from looking for themselves. In this pamphlet it is stated that "Here [in Upholland] during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, resided a family named Thules. In our now happily voluminous literature about Lancashire families the name Thules does not occur except in connection with the subject of this narrative. Mr Joseph Gillow, who is perhaps the highest living authority on this matter, writes to me that, after having looked over all the lists of Lancashire wills, etc., besides the whole of the Harleian Society's publications of visitations of various counties, he could find no name that could

¹ "Laboro quantum valeo in Catalago Martyrum concinnando et maximam difficultatem in definiendo nativitatis cujusque loco exorior." West. Arch. XX, p. 91.

² Mr. T. Backhouse Ecroyd is not correct in stating that the Whalley Registers are actually the oldest in the county. Cf. L.P.R.S., Vol. VII. Cf. the registers of Whittington, Croston, Farnworth.

have been corrupted into Thules." The name is certainly an uncommon one, but its extreme rarity is, in fact, an enormous help to our purpose. For if the name John Thules be found in the Whalley Register, it is more than ever likely to be that of the Martyr, dates of course corresponding.

Far from there being, in the Registers at least, no name that could have been corrupted into Thules, the first volume of the Whalley Registers (1538-1601) contains seven references to the Thules family or families, starting with the baptism of Jane in 1562 and ending in 1574 with the burial of William the Schoolmaster and father of at least three of the children.¹ The most important entry for our present purpose is that of 28 December, 1568. The *Liber Ruber* of the English College, Rome, gives us the information that in 1590 "Iohannes Thulesius Angelus Cestrensis diocesis annum agens 22 ad Theologiam positivam idoneus receptus fuit in hoc Anglorum collegium . . ."² John would thus have been born in 1568 or thereabouts. In this very year we find in the Whalley Register the following: "De Baptisatis Mense Decembris A'no Do' M^oD^oLXVIII. Johes Thowles filius Willmi. 28 die 1568."³ The coincidence is too extraordinary to allow of any other interpretation than that the case for Bishop Smith is established.

There is other confirmatory evidence besides. The Thules family was connected with Whalley for some years both before and after the birth of John. William, John's father, became Master of the Grammar School there in 1571 in succession to Peter Carter, and is recorded as receiving the Master's stipend of £13 6s. 8d. in that year.⁴ His children were baptized at Whalley Church: Jane (1566), John (1568), and Robert (1572). Three other Thules children—possibly also his daughters, though the father's Christian name is not given—were also baptized in the same church: Jane (1562), who may have died in infancy, since a later child is also named Jane, or who may have belonged to another family; Elizabeth (1563); and Bar-

¹ L.P.R.S., 7. With this entry references to the family cease. From 1601 there is a gap of nearly four years in the Registers. Then the second volume takes us as far as 1653, but there is no further reference to Thules. Cf. L.P.R.S., 74.

² C.R.S., 37, p. 71.

³ I do not doubt but that the actual spelling is "Thewles" and that the transcriber has mistaken the Elizabethan "e" for "o".

⁴ Cf. "Whalley Church and Abbey", by Taylor Taswell, p. 172.

bara (1565). Perhaps the family came to reside at Whalley only just before 1562, for there is no mention of Christopher Thules, who was born about 1559-60.¹ At any rate, he too belonged to Whalley at a later date, as we know from a letter preserved among the State Papers in the Public Record Office and dated 18 April, 1590. There is no need to quote the letter here. But it ends: "Your moste dearelye beloved and obedient Sonne Christopher Thewles," and is addressed "To his Lovinge Mother Anne Thewles, Deliver these at Whalley in Lancashire."²

There is quite a possibility that Anne Thules was one of the Ashton family long associated with Whalley and the owners of considerable property there. But the present writer has not been able to establish the fact. While it could hardly be expected that the Ashton menfolk would marry into the Thules family, it would not be at all unlikely that a younger daughter should be considered quite a suitable match for a Headmaster of the School. Indeed, one wonders if the Ashtons had anything to do with William Thules' appointment. Be that as it may, the name Ashton was taken by Christopher Thules as an alias, and the mother's name was quite often used in this way. He had been arrested at Salisbury in connection with the Babington Plot,³ and is described in the Prison Lists for the Gatehouse as "Xpofer Thules als Aston".⁴ The Martyr, John Thules, has also a recorded connexion with the Ashton family, being described in a contemporary ballad as of their kinsfolk. This ballad or poem is preserved in the British Museum and bears the rather quaint title of "The Song of the Death of Mr Thewlis. To the tune of 'Dainty come thou to me'."⁵ The twenty-first verse is as follows:

His kinsfolk in like cause
Did proffer gold and fee,
If his faith he would refuse
A Protestant to be.

¹ Cf. Liber Ruber, 1579, "Christoforus Theulesius Annorum 19. laicus logicam aggressurus iuravit . . ." C.R.S., 37, p. 12.

² P.R.O. Dom. Eliz., 231, 69.

³ P.R.O. Dom. Eliz., cxiii, 64.

⁴ Brit. Mus. Lansdowne MSS., iv, 458. C.R.S., ii, 279.

⁵ Brit. Mus. Add. 15225, printed in Pollen, Acts, p. 194 sq.

That the kinsfolk were Ashtons may be gathered from the same incident as recorded in *Exemplar Literarum*: ". . . Quidam etiam illius Comitatus Vir Nobilis, nomine Ashtonus, sacerdoti spondebat annum viginti librarum Anglicanarum stipendium ea conditione, ut illo se sacramento obligaret . . ."¹ Challoner gives the additional information that Mr Ashton of Lever was the Martyr's godson.²

There is no need to go on indefinitely trying to bring new evidence in support of what, after all, is but a single small point in the life of a Martyr. Enough has been given above to satisfy the reader that the Venerable John Thules must be accounted henceforth, without any reserve, a native of Whalley. One trusts that the devotion of Upholland men will not be dimmed by the fact. And the balance of compensation will be equally met if Stonyhurst accepts this Martyr as its own and regards him as one of its Patrons.

J. E. BAMBER

IN ANGELORUM TUTELA

EVERY Sunday in church at the *Asperges* or *Vidi aquam* before Mass we are accustomed to hear the priest praying God to send His holy Angel from heaven to "guard, cherish, protect, visit and defend" His people gathered there: *omnes habitantes in hoc habitaculo*. A study of the Ritual³ will serve to remind us that Holy Church invokes the presence of angels not only upon churches but upon every sojourning place of man, literally from the cradle to the grave. The prayer after the *Asperges* is used in a slightly different form when the houses of the faithful in Catholic countries are blessed with new Holy Water at Easter (342); it is recited, as in church, when the priest enters the room where the sick await Communion or Viaticum (144). There is another

¹ *Exemplar Literarum*, 1617 ed.

² *Memoirs*, p. 343.

³ *RITUALE ROMANUM* (Desclée). Page numbers in brackets below refer the reader to the 1928 edition.

splendid prayer for blessing a house or a schoolroom, asking that the angels may actually live there: *inter parietes domus istius Angeli tuæ lucis habitent* (345). Even over the most temporary dwellings of her children the Church makes bold to claim angelic protection and intervention. An angel is asked for to go with and guard the ship from peril when it is blessed (346), to watch the bridge and all who shall pass over it (599), as well as to accompany pilgrims on their long journeys (249).¹ At the solemn blessing of a new railway, Raphael, the Archangel of Travel, is invoked (690) and a good angel (*Angelum bonum de cœlis comitem benignus adjuuge*) is summoned to the blessing of aeroplanes (597) by Him Who maketh the clouds His chariot and walketh on the wings of the wind (Ps. ciii, 3). When stretchers are dedicated for carrying the sick (633), it is *tuis Angelis comitantibus*, and in the cemeteries where our dead are lying *tubam primi Archangeli exspectantibus* (384) every grave is blessed with a guardian angel: *Deus, cujus miseratione animæ fidelium requiescunt hunc tumulum benedicere dignare, eique Angelum tuum sanctum deputa custodem* (237).

It is an extension of the divine work of redemption, God's constantly operative remedy for the fall in which all nature shares (see Romans viii, 20-22), that His priests have power to exorcize the malevolent spirits present and active throughout the natural world. The Ritual shows that the Church can bless every creature, animate or inanimate, from a silkworm (639) to a fire engine (603), and, generally speaking, angelic agency is either invoked or implicit in all these ritual blessings, or alluded to in one way or another. So does the Blessing of Oil (357) open with the majestic prayer: *Domine Deus omnipotens cui astat exercitus Angelorum cum tremore, quorum servitium spirituale cognoscitur, dignare respicere, benedicere, et sanctificare hanc creaturam olei*; so do we beg the Bread of Angels to bless our bread (635): even the mill in which the flour is ground must have an angel of light to watch over it (613). Sacramentals or objects having a direct relation to worship are blessed as a matter of course. At the blessing of a stone cross God is called upon *cui assistit Angelorum legio* (671); when the foundations of a new church are put in it is

¹ Or monks setting out on their weekly walk; see the Monastic Breviary Supplement.

with the pregnant words *fuga daemonum*, *Angeli pacis ingressus* (371), and at the shorter blessing of fonts or baptismal water in missionary countries the priest prays *Angelum sanctitatis emittas* (517). Such blessings as these are for rare or relatively rare occasions, but the faithful are everywhere familiar with the first prayer of Ash Wednesday: "Almighty and eternal God . . . vouchsafe to send Thy holy Angel from heaven to bless and hallow these ashes": *mittere digneris sc̄tum Angelum tuum de caelis, qui benedicat et sanctificet hos cineres* (549).

It is a reason, perhaps too often forgotten, for adoring God's Providence that we are each one of us placed under the guidance of good angels from the first moment of our existence. The babe unborn is blessed with angels' company (620), the as yet unborn Christian has an angel to lead him to the Saving font: *te quaesumus, Domine, ut mittere digneris sc̄tum Angelum tuum de caelis, qui custodiat . . . hunc famulum tuum et perducatur eum ad gratiam Baptismi tui* (46, 54). But the rarity of adult baptism with the full rite in our day keeps its tremendous prayers and exorcisms locked up in the Ritual, seldom studied and therefore little appreciated. Children are placed under angelic tutelage with the greatest confidence (624, 704), and particularly the sick child (627) because of Our Lord's word that "they have angels of their own in heaven that behold the face of my heavenly Father continually" (Matt. xviii, 10: xix, 14). The good angels who lead souls to Baptism *super aquam refectionis* are certainly present and not idle beside all the waters of life which are the Sacraments. Christian art has attempted with varying success to portray them *millia laetantium* gathered about the altar at Mass; the parables of the Good Shepherd and the lost piece of silver (Luke xv) assure us that their joy *super uno peccatore paenitentiam agente* surrounds the confessional also. The Archangel Raphael, whose part in the history of Tobias makes him the most attractive of all angelic visitants in the Old Testament, is very naturally invoked in the liturgy of Marriage (542); his advice concerning it well repays study. All through our lives angels follow us (Saint Cecilia was but stating the plainest of truths when she told Valerian *in Angeli tutela sum*), but as we approach the end, in the strong consolation which the Church offers to the suffering and the dying, their help is more than ever

insistently and constantly invoked. The Gospel chosen to be read to the sick (John v) reminds them of the healing angel of the pool (183); in all the prayers which precede the administration of the last Unction there is mention of angels (a) *effugiat ex hoc loco accessus daemonum, adsint angeli pacis*, (b) *Angelum bonum custodem*, (c) *mittere digneris sanctum Angelum de caelis* (the *Asperges* prayer). Even when these three prayers are omitted, as they can be in emergency, the holy Anointing itself *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti* is carried out *per invocationem omnium sanctorum Angelorum, Archangelorum* etc. (154). The glorious texts for the Commendation of the Dying bid the Christian soul go forth in the name of all the nine angelic choirs (196, etc.) and repeatedly beg for angels to come out and meet the departing soul: *Splendidus Angelorum coetus occurrat . . . te comitantibus Angelis . . . Aperiantur ei caeli, collaentur illi Angeli . . . Suscipiat eum sc̃tus Michael Archangelus Dei . . . Veniant illi obviam sc̃ti Angeli Dei et perducant eum in civitatem caelestis Jerusalem*. Nor does death interrupt the persistence of the same thought, for immediately the soul has left the body there is sung or recited *Subvenite, sc̃ti Dei, occurrite Angeli Dei . . . Suscipiat te Christus, qui vocavit te, et in sinum Abrahae Angeli deducant te*. The mournful moments when the body is being borne to the grave are entirely changed by the triumphant cry: *Deducant te Angeli . . . chorus Angelorum te suscipiat* (236), and the last phrase of the last prayer at the grave (240) is *tua miseratio societ angelicis choris*.

In the mind of Saint Benedict it is part of our awareness of the presence of God to remember the angels. To remember that they give an account to the Lord that made us of all our deeds by night and by day, to remember them above all at the *Opus Dei*: *In conspectu angelorum psallam tibi Deus meus*. But we live in a very materialistic age and country and our attention is spread over so many objects that it is easier, while accepting the existence of angels, not to advert to them, not to remember. Yet there is profit for us in their contact, and it would be an enrichment of our supernatural life were we to accustom ourselves to the fact of their existence, exert our thought upon them, and especially turn to them very constantly for aid.¹ In the Collect for the Feast of Saint Michael, the liturgy teaches us to pray

¹ Sheed, *Theology and Sanity*, p. 115.

that our life on earth may be protected by those who are always present with God in heaven, ministering to Him: in the Introit for the Votive Mass of the Angels (from Ps. cii) we can associate our praise with theirs: "Bless the Lord all you angels of His, angels mighty in strength that carry out His commandment, attentive to the word He utters."

G. M. DURNFORD

THE VICARS APOSTOLIC OF ENGLAND

VIII. ENGLAND DIVIDED INTO EIGHT VICARIATES (continued)

B

THE WESTERN DISTRICT

- 1840-1843. Augustine Baines, Bp of Siga.
- 1843-1845. Charles Baggs, Bp of Pella.
- 1846-1848. Bernard Ullathorne, O.S.B., Bp of Hetalona.
- 1848-1850. Joseph Hendren, O.S.F., Bp of Uranopolis.

THE EASTERN DISTRICT

- 1840-1850. William Wareing, Bp of Ariopolis.

THE NORTHERN DISTRICT

- 1840-1847. Francis Mostyn, Bp of Abydos.
- 1847-1848. William Riddell, Bp of Longona.
- 1848-1850. William Hogarth, Bp of Samosata.

THE CENTRAL DISTRICT

- 1840-1848. Thomas Walsh, Bp of Cambysopolis.
 - 1848-1850. Bernard Ullathorne, Bp of Hetalona.
- Vol. xxxii

A TRULY remarkable character was Bishop Baines of the Western District. He had "a strangely difficult temperament, and his episcopate was in fact one continued history of quarrels and disputes, which could not but be fraught with evil consequences to religion".¹ A monk of Ampleforth, he was yet the means of bringing that monastery to the verge of ruin, and although a regular he was from the day of his consecration at daggers drawn with both monks and nuns. As a young monk he had been "facile in speech, fertile in conception, bold in his plans, and at the same time restless and changeful and pushing in their execution";² and these qualities characterized him to the end. Yet his gifts were brilliant, his zeal tremendous, and his manner could be fascinating, so that he had many fervid admirers; but as Wiseman, himself one of his early admirers, found, to remain in his good graces it was necessary to assent to his views and conform to his will in everything. Inevitably, then, he provoked great distrust and opposition.

Consecrated Coadjutor to Bishop Collingridge in January 1823, at the age of thirty-six, he immediately formed elaborate plans to provide a seminary for the District; it was in August of that same year that he proposed to the monks of Downside that their school and monastery should become the College-Seminary of the Western District, with himself as ordinary Superior of Downside, while the monks were to be called on to work in his District and nowhere else. He seems to have been painfully surprised when the monks indignantly rejected the scheme.³ He then proposed that the Ampleforth monks might serve his purpose, and therefore suggested that the monks at Downside and those at Ampleforth might exchange properties; but this, too, was instantly negatived by the Benedictines. At this point the Bishop went to Italy for his health, and in Rome he won over to his views the Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Capellari (the future Pope Gregory XVI), himself a regular. Writing from Rome in 1827, he said that he had told the Cardinal that if he ever became Vicar Apostolic (he was still only Coadjutor) he

¹ Dr Ward: *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*.

² Dom Cuthbert Almond: *The History of Ampleforth Abbey*.

³ It would have involved their secession from the English Benedictine Congregation, of which they were the senior community.

would ask him to hand over Downside to him, and that the Cardinal replied that the petition would be granted.

Fortified by this support, Dr Baines now put forward the extraordinary claim that the Benedictine houses in England had never been canonically erected, as they had been set up without formal permission from Rome or from the Bishops; that therefore the monks were not exempt from episcopal control and their vows were invalid; and that consequently the English Benedictines were not monks but missionary priests. This case he then submitted to Rome, but the monks heard of it and secured a delay in the giving of a decision until they could put their case. Meanwhile, in 1829, Bishop Collingridge died, and thereupon Dr Baines returned to England, where he had a stormy interview with the Prior of Downside and Dom Joseph Brown,¹ at which he told them that if they would not give way he would set up a school and seminary of his own (in rivalry to Downside School), and would insist on a restriction of the number of boys at Downside, and on the monks paying an annual contribution to the seminary. As this had no effect, and as the monks declined to state the grounds on which they claimed exemption from episcopal control (since the case was now *sub judice* in Rome), Dr Baines then took the unprecedented step of withdrawing faculties from all the Downside priests. In doing so, however, he completely overreached himself and much damaged his case in the eyes of Rome. He was in fact reprimanded and ordered to restore the faculties. He had also thereby alienated the sympathies of the other Vicars Apostolic. But the situation was a desperate one for Downside, which was now truly fighting for its life, and the monks sent Dom Joseph Brown to Rome to fight their case there. He was at first very coldly received by Cardinal Capellari when he got there in November 1829, but his ability and tact soon brought the Cardinal to see the matter in a fresh light, and eventually Brown completely won his case. Not only was Dr Baines instructed, as already stated, to restore the faculties of the monks, but the validity of the monks' vows, and the exemption of the monks from episcopal control, were confirmed. Fr Brown had

¹ The future Vicar Apostolic who in 1840 was appointed to the Welsh District previously part of Dr Baines's Vicariate).

performed a signal service for his monastery; he had moreover made a lifelong friend of the Cardinal, who in the following year became Pope, and who ten years later was to select him to be Vicar Apostolic of Wales.

Meanwhile Dr Baines realized there was now no hope of reaching an agreement with Downside and so he looked elsewhere for his seminary, eventually purchasing Prior Park for the purpose. But he still had to staff it, and this was where Ampleforth entered the picture. He spent the winter there, and though at first he had a chilly reception from most of the monks, in the end his personal fascination and intellectual gifts had their effect, and he actually succeeded (astonishing as it seems) in winning over the Prior, Sub-Prior, and Procurator, and in persuading them to leave Ampleforth and join him at Prior Park along with as many of the boys as they could bring away. The three superiors who thus left Ampleforth were subsequently secularized, though two of them tried in later life to regain their monastic status. The Prior, Lawrence Burgess, eventually became the second Bishop of Clifton. The whole episode was a crushing setback for Ampleforth, and it looked as though the monastery had received its deathblow. Bishop Baines was confident that it had, but it rallied magnificently, to become before many years had passed more prosperous than ever, and in their hour of need they were helped by Downside, whence two monks (one of them the future Bishop Ullathorne) were sent to assist them.

It is unfortunate that we have had to give so much space to this affair, but it was the outstanding incident of Dr Baines's episcopate, though only one of the disputes that he had with regulars.¹ At Prior Park he was at first very successful, and the fact that he himself lived there and kept great state gave a *cachet* to the College which attracted pupils to it. Unhappily, in 1836 a large part of it was burned down in a disastrous fire, and although it was rebuilt, the resulting financial troubles were a terrible weight on the Bishop for the rest of his life. Moreover, he quarrelled with the Fathers of Charity who were in charge of it and they eventually left. In the end the College had to be sold some years after the Bishop's death to pay the debts he had

¹ Others were with the nuns of Cannington and with the Jesuits at Bristol.

accumulated. Towards the end of his life he was in further trouble, this time over his attitude towards prayers for the conversion of England. Fr Ignatius Spencer, the Passionist, had asked the Vicars Apostolic to permit these to be said publicly and regularly, and though Bishop Walsh was in favour of this, the other three Vicars disapproved, Dr Baines most strongly of all. It is not necessary to go into his reasons, but he devoted his Pastoral letter of 1840 to the subject and declared that he did not consider the conversion of the nation in the least probable, and that it would be imprudent to pray for it publicly owing to the danger of arousing fresh persecution. This was reported to Rome, whither he was peremptorily summoned to give an explanation. The Holy Father was highly annoyed and censured the Bishop, but refrained from his original intention of removing him from his Vicariate. Three years later Dr Baines died suddenly at Prior Park. A man of first-rate ability and a splendid preacher, it was unfortunate that his headstrong and obstinate nature aroused such opposition and led him into imprudent paths; for he was capable of arousing great devotion and admiration and he was idolized by the students and staff at Prior Park. It is pleasant to know that in his last few years he was completely reconciled with the Benedictines, and when, some years after his death, Prior Park was given up, the monks of Downside removed his body from there and interred it at Downside, where it now rests in the Abbey Church beneath an imposing tomb.

His successor, Bishop Baggs, was of a totally different type, and was one of the very few Irishmen in the list of English Vicars Apostolic; he was, moreover, the only secular to rule the Western District. The son of a Protestant father, he was converted at the age of fourteen, and finished his education at the English College in Rome, where he had an exceptionally brilliant career. He is said to have been one of the most distinguished scholars and linguists the College ever had; as a student he headed the lists in Mathematics, Hebrew, Physics, Theology, and Scripture, and he was moreover fluent in numerous modern languages. He was also very well known as a controversialist writer, and his reputation at the Papal Court stood extremely high. When he was only twenty-

eight he became Vice-Rector of the English College, Rome, under the rectorship of Wiseman, and six years later, when Wiseman became Coadjutor to Dr Walsh, Dr Baggs was appointed Rector. But his rule was short, for after three years as Rector he succeeded Dr Baines as Vicar Apostolic of the Western District at the age of thirty-seven. Thus his life had been one of brilliant success and promised a future of the utmost value to the Church in England. But God willed otherwise, for only eighteen months after his return to this country he died at Prior Park.

The death of Dr Baggs brought to the episcopate perhaps the most notable of all the Vicars Apostolic, certainly one of the three greatest: Bernard Ullathorne, O.S.B. Here again, as in the cases of Challoner and Milner, the chronicler quails at the prospect of writing of such a figure within the compass of a few lines. But the details of his life, thanks to his own *Autobiography*, and still more so to the two exhaustive and penetrating volumes by the late Abbot Cuthbert Butler, are widely known. Unconventional in his upbringing, he remained unconventional and a "character" throughout his life, so that countless stories are told of him. The son of a country grocer, his early years were spent at sea "before the mast", where he was wont to say he had made his real novitiate, and not until he went to Downside School at the age of seventeen did he receive any real religious instruction. Till then he had not even been confirmed, nor had he made his first Communion. But he was already wise in his knowledge of his fellow men, and his piety and zeal were all the greater for having been aroused somewhat later than is usual with Catholic schoolboys. In 1832, seven years after his profession as a monk at Downside, though then only twenty-six, he was sent out to Australia as Vicar General to Bishop Morris, O.S.B. Of the extreme value of his work there it is sufficient to say that he is generally considered to have laid the foundations of Catholicism in that country. Furthermore, his work amongst the convicts of Botany Bay and the revelations which he made as to the horrors of the life there, especially of the conditions on the transportation ships, made a world-wide sensation and led to wholesale reforms. His work in Australia for the Church made him a marked man at Rome, and before he was forty he

had three times received the offer of a bishopric (those of Hobart, Adelaide, and Perth respectively), all of which he declined.

But some five years after his return to England he was again nominated to be Bishop, this time in succession to Dr Baggs, and on this occasion the pressure applied by Cardinal Acton induced him to accept. The Cardinal had written to him: "If honours and riches had gathered round the mitre hanging over your Lordship's head, then perhaps your virtue might have found out some motives to allege for resisting the offer. But in the present circumstances it is pain, trouble, and labour which is offered you, and therefore I trust that through love for Christ and His Church you will accept the burden." Such a plea Dr Ullathorne could not withstand, and he was duly consecrated at Coventry by Bishop Briggs. Two years later, however, on the promotion of Dr Walsh from the Midlands to the London District, he was transferred to the more important Central District, where he was to remain for the rest of his long life, first as Vicar Apostolic and then as Bishop of Birmingham. From the start of his episcopate Dr Ullathorne took a leading part in the councils of the Bishops by reason of his natural abilities, his wide knowledge of the world, and especially his experience in regard to the setting up of the Hierarchy in Australia. And so it was natural that he should have been chosen in 1848 to go to Rome as representative of his fellow Bishops to petition for the restoration of the Hierarchy in England and to conduct the subsequent negotiations there. In this capacity he rendered valuable service and played a predominant part in bringing about the change of ecclesiastical organization which so many had at heart.

For forty-three years he continued as Bishop, a longer rule than that of any of the other Vicars Apostolic, and he left an indelible mark on his times. Wilfrid Ward¹ speaks of his marked "gifts of character, piety, and sagacity", and it was indeed those three qualities which formed his strength. Throughout his life he was a typical representative of the old-fashioned English piety of the school of Challoner, and as such was poles apart in tastes from many of the Oxford converts; and yet, despite this,

¹ *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman.*

he became the confidant and friend of such mutually contrasting characters as Newman and Manning. But the main part of his work lies outside our limits, for he was a Vicar Apostolic for only four years. He continued to rule his diocese long after all the other Vicars Apostolic had gone to their reward, and as he lay dying on St Benedict's Day in 1889 he himself was heard faintly to murmur, "The last of the Vicars Apostolic is passing." A venerable link with the past, and a worthy representative of that long and often heroic line of Confessors and shepherds of the flock of Christ in this land, his death meant the severing of an historic tie and the end of an era.

DOM BASIL HEMPHILL, O.S.B.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

THE first duty of any chronicler of Biblical news and publications must be to pay a short tribute to the remarkable man who until recently held the important position of Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. Père Jacques Marie Vosté, O.P., who died in Rome on 24 February after an illness of some weeks' duration, had been Secretary for almost exactly a decade. The greater part of his term of office fell in the war years, but the consultors outside Rome were able, in a variety of ways, to maintain contact with "the centre of unity and communion", and during the dark hours of 1940 and 1941 it was always a consolation to receive his letters, brim full as they were of counsel, wisdom, and confidence in the triumph of the righteous cause. In a recent article in the April number of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* Fr Richard T. Murphy, O.P., has given a detailed account of the Father's last days, and a masterly summary of the chief events of his life and teaching. Père Vosté was a Belgian of Flemish stock, born in Bruges on 3 May,

1883, who entered the Dominican Order in 1900, was ordained in 1906, and passed from his scriptural studies under Mgr Ladeuze and Canon van Hoonacker at Louvain to the "most delightful of all houses of study" (as he styled it in a letter to me written in 1922), the École Biblique de S. Étienne, Jerusalem. After a two years' course under Pères Lagrange, Vincent, Abel, and Savignac (to mention no others) he returned to Rome for his Licentiate in Scripture, and was thereupon appointed to the faculty of the Collegio Angelico, in which he continued to lecture until a year or two before his lamented death. He was named a consultor of the Biblical Commission in 1929, and was also a consultor of the Congregations for the Eastern Church and of Seminaries and Studies, a member of the Commission for codifying the Oriental Canon Law, and president of the Commission that edited the Chaldean Pontifical.

It would be both easy and delightful to attempt an estimate of Père Vosté as an indefatigable worker, a stimulating lecturer, and a writer of many learned works, who remained throughout his career a charmingly simple and human man, loyal, affectionate, discreet, and far-seeing. A full list of his published works down to 1943 may be found in the volume of *Biblica et Orientalia* issued by the Angelicum to greet his sixtieth birthday.¹ Among these may be specially mentioned his brochure *De Scripturarum veritate iuxta recentiora Ecclesiae documenta* (1924), *De synopticorum mutua relatione et dependentia* (1928), the two series of *Studia* (*Paulina*, 2nd ed., 1941; *Ioannea*, 2nd ed., 1930), the large volumes *Parabolae Domini Nostri* (2nd ed., 1933), and *De Passione et Morte Iesu Christi* (1937), which last may well be regarded as his masterpiece. Fr Murphy, in the article already praised, fittingly refers to the "three outstanding events in the scriptural world" that took place during Père Vosté's term of office, namely the encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (1943), the new translation of the Psalter in 1945, and his own letter to Cardinal Suhard of 16 January of last year. His death is a notable loss to the Roman Curia, to the Dominican Order, and to all the world of Catholic scriptural studies. *Lux perpetua luceat ei!*

It was announced in the *Osservatore Romano* for 10 May that

¹ *Angelicum*, Salita del Grillo, 1, Rome, 1943. Vol. XX, Fasc. 1-3.

the Supreme Pontiff had appointed, as the new secretary of the Commission, Dom Athanasius Miller, O.S.B., professor at Sant' Anselmo and a fellow student of Père Vosté at the École Biblique de S. Étienne, Jerusalem. Dom Miller is the author of the commentary *Das Buch Judith* in the Bonn Bible (1940) and was responsible (with Dom Adalbertus Metzinger) for the excellent re-edition of Dom Hildebrand Höpfl's *Introductio Specialis in Vetus Testamentum*.

Under the title "The Scrolls newly discovered in Palestine" Fr R. T. O'Callaghan, S.J., of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, contributes an admirable summary of the recent discussions on the newly found Hebrew manuscripts to the April number of *Scripture* (pp. 41-6). Readers of those two excellent periodicals the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (*BASOR*) and the *Biblical Archaeologist* (*BA*) will already have gathered that Dr G. E. Wright's phrase, "The most important discovery ever made in Old Testament manuscripts",¹ did not exaggerate the value of the finds, and now Fr O'Callaghan, writing as a Catholic scholar of great competence, describes in some detail the various scrolls, and discusses the all-important question of dating, which, for the most complete manuscript of all, the Isaiah scroll, may well, as Albright contends, be reckoned as the second half of the second century B.C. "Scholars are agreed," in Fr O'Callaghan's words, "that the new discoveries will render imperative a thorough revision of Hebrew grammar" (p. 43). The latest number of *BASOR* (No. 113, February 1949) to arrive in this country adds some further information, which includes a palaeographic study of the Jerusalem scrolls (Dr John C. Trever), a continuation of an article on "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript" (Professor Millar Burrows), and an attempt by Dr Solomon Birnbaum to determine the "Date of the Isaiah Scroll", which concludes that the Isaiah manuscript "was not written during the third century B.C.E. or after the middle of the first pre-Christian century. This leaves us with 150 years to limit down" (p. 35). Readers of the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* may be referred to the February number, in which appears one of Père Vosté's last articles, entitled: "Hebrew Manuscripts Recently Discovered".

¹ *BA.*, Vol. XI, May 1948, No. 2, p. 21.

The latest addition to the "Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures" is *The Book of Daniel*,¹ translated with a full introduction and very thorough notes by the general editor of the series, Fr C. C. Lattey, S.J. There have been few commentaries on Daniel by a Catholic author during the past decade; the last pre-war venture of the kind, unless I am mistaken, is the very thorough revision of P. Knabenbauer's *Commentarius in Librum Daniel* in the "Cursus Scripturae Sacrae" series, prepared by P. Joseph Linder, S.J., and issued in 1939.² This, as Fr Lattey remarks in his bibliography, is "practically a new work, succeeding and superseding" the 1891 edition of Knabenbauer. It seems to me to be a work of the highest value, fully up to the level of such non-Catholic commentaries as those by J. A. Montgomery and R. H. Charles. Fr Lattey's volume is, like other numbers in the same series, primarily a translation, and a very clear and accurate one, but the introduction runs to all but fifty pages and discusses in six chapters the contents of the book, its linguistic character, its apocalyptic character, its historical character, its authorship, and its deuterocanonical parts. The translation is followed by some seventy pages of notes in small but clear print, and, while the discussion of individual points cannot equal that of a full-size commentary, some reference, at least, is made to any point of the smallest importance. Fr Lattey tells us that he first began to lecture on Daniel in 1912, and adds, "I may say that since then it has seldom been absent for a long time from my thought and study." Admittedly Daniel is one of the most difficult of the Old Testament books, and the substantial bibliography (pp. xi-xiii) in Fr Lattey's edition is a testimony to some part of the labour involved in preparing such a commentary. Readers will note from the start Fr Lattey's claim that any full exegetical commentary on the book "must take into account, as it were, three historical planes, that of the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and of the first and second comings of Christ" (p. vii). I am happy to recommend this useful and readable commentary, which continues, perhaps in a somewhat ampler form than usual, the splendid tradition of the Westminster Version.

¹ Dublin: Brown & Nolan, 1948. Pp. lii + 143. Price 12s. 6d.

² Paris, Lethielleux, 1939. Pp. ix + 548.

Another post-war study of Daniel, and one that appeared a year or so before Fr Lattey's volume, is among the first numbers of *La Sacra Bibbia*, an edition of the Vulgate text with a translation and a commentary in Italian, that has been prepared under the direction of Mgr Salvatore Garofalo, a professor in the faculty of the Propaganda Ateneo. There are to be thirty-four fascicles in all, and of these, so far as I am aware, four have been published. *Daniele* is the work of P. Giovanni Rinaldi, C.R.S.,¹ and might be usefully compared with Fr Lattey's work, which in some respects it resembles. It gives, however, the Latin text as well as a translation, and has a division on each page, between text and notes, devoted to textual criticism. References are made to such works as Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*, and Palacios, *Grammatica aramaico-biblica*. The bibliography is fuller than Fr Lattey's. The notes are arranged at the foot of the text they accompany, but the two-columns-to-the-page arrangement is not very attractive, and the notes themselves appear to be more fragmentary and less suited for continuous reading than Fr Lattey's. On the whole, I should say that a student who possessed both volumes would be more than ordinarily well equipped for the study of an Old Testament book, and either or both would introduce him by easy stages to such larger works as Linder and Montgomery.

Two other commentaries in the same series are those on *Ezechiele* by Professor Francesco Spadafora of the Benevento seminary² and *Le Epistole Cattoliche di Giacomo, Pietro, Giovanni e Giuda* by Dr Pietro de Ambroggi.³ It does not seem necessary to say much about these volumes except that they are good specimens of their class and give a reasonably full introduction to the literatures of their subjects.

The fourth of the published numbers of *La Sacra Bibbia* is by far the most remarkable of the series as it is at present known to those outside the editorial circle. It is the volume of *Introduzione Generale alla Sacra Bibbia*, and is the final and sufficient memorial to the great ability of the late Don Gaetano Perrella, C.M.,

¹ Turin: Marietti, 1947. Pp. 135 + 8 pp. of plates. Price L.350.

² Marietti, 1948. Pp. 357. Price L.850.

³ Marietti, 1947. Pp. 285 + 5 pp. of plates. Price L.550.

whose all too early death occurred on 18 January, 1946. A tribute to this grand worker is paid by Père Vosté in some preliminary pages on "Gaetano Perrella e la scienza biblica".¹ To a casual observer one volume of general introduction to the Bible is much like another, but the present volume is almost in a class of its own by reason of its patient clarity, its sureness of information, and its immense wealth of references and quotations. Perhaps it is almost too detailed for a student who is beginning his studies in Holy Scripture. It will, almost certainly, be of greatest service to those who have already worked over the various treatises (Inspiration, the Canon of Scripture, Texts and Versions, Hermeneutics, and, finally, a history of Biblical interpretation) in more elementary manuals. The "Documentazione" (pp. 1*-33*), in addition to many apt quotations from Fathers and Councils, prints the more vital sections of *Providentissimus Deus*, and of *Spiritus Paraclitus*, and gives the whole text of the Commission's letter of 16 August, 1941, the *responsum* of 22 August, 1943, the whole of *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, and a complete Italian translation of Père Vosté's letter to Cardinal Suhard. Don Perrella's pupils, like those of Goldsmith's village schoolmaster, must often have wondered "that one small head could carry all he knew". It is satisfying to realize that the cream of many articles in the review *Divus Thomas* (of Piacenza) may be found in this accomplished and memorable volume of general introduction.

Those who have been students for more than half a lifetime of the two magnificent volumes of the late Père Prat's *La Théologie de S. Paul* may sometimes have wished for a more compact treatment, written for those without specialized training and restricted to what is essential for the due understanding of St Paul's thought. This has now been provided by Père Joseph Bonsirven, S.J., the justly celebrated author of *Le Judaïsme Palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*² and other standard works. It is entitled *L'Évangile de Paul*,³ and, like all the author's works, it is a model of clarity and good arrangement. After an introduction that discusses the sources of Pauline study, St Paul's style

¹ Marietti, 1948. Pp. xx + 33* + 343 + an appendix of 19 plates. Price L.950.

² Paris, 1935. Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, Vol. X, pp. 388-9.

³ Paris: Aubier. Pp. 364. Price about 15s.

and dialectic, his gospel of Christ crucified, and the plan and development of his teaching, there are chapters on his conversion, on the Eternal Father's revelation of the Son in whom the Blessed Trinity is revealed, on Christ's universal mediation, on His bestowal of grace through the Sacraments and through the Church, and, lastly, on His mediation in regard to the *novissima*. It is a simple plan, and one that allows the author full scope for developing all the vital conceptions, with copious references to and quotations from the Apostle's own words. One of many pleasing characteristics of the work is its extreme frankness in admitting the difficulties that beset an interpreter; another is Père Bonsirven's rejection of easy solutions, such as that of Guntermann on the question of the Parousia. An English translation of this book would be of great service to readers who would be likely to miss some of the *nuances* of the original. So far as I am aware, not more than one of Père Bonsirven's works (*Sur les ruines du Temple*) has been translated into English. It is high time that a change should be made in this state of affairs.¹

JOHN M. T. BARTON

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

PLURALITY OF QUASI-DOMICILE

Is it possible for a person to have more than one quasi-domicile? (X.)

REPLY

Canon 92, §1. Domicilium acquiritur commoratione in aliqua paroecia . . . quae commoratio vel coniuncta sit cum animo ibi perpetuo manendi, si nihil inde avocet, vel sit protracta ad decennium completum.

¹ A short article on Père Bonsirven is to be read in the new French encyclopaedia *Catholicisme, hier, aujourd'hui, demain*, fasc. 5, col. 158. Paris: Letouzey, 1949.

§2. Quasi-domicilium acquiritur commoratione uti supra, quae vel coniuncta sit cum animo ibi manendi saltem ad maiorem anni partem, si nihil inde avocet, vel sit reapse protracta ad maiorem anni partem.

There has always been some unwillingness on the part of lawyers to admit simultaneous plurality even of domicile, since this would seem to be almost a recognition of bi-location. The civil law in most places preserves the principle of one domicile for purposes of social security, such as voting, but even so the conditions of modern life have imposed exceptions. The canon law considers not so much the locality as the relations of a person to the locality, and is more concerned with personal individual rights than with social security; this tendency, which may be called "personalist", logically led to the recognition, in canon law, of a plurality of domicile, and we find the law codified accordingly under the title *De Personis*.¹

The conditions for acquiring a quasi-domicile are less strict than for a domicile, but the effects of both, one or two matters apart, are identical,² and one would expect to find, once the notion of quasi-domicile became established, that the notion of a plural quasi-domicile would also be admitted. Pre-code writers, however, whilst recognizing the possibility of a legal quasi-domicile existing together with a voluntary one, would not admit the existence of a plural voluntary quasi-domicile,³ for the criterion "greater part of the year" seemed inapplicable to two places, since the choice of the second appeared to terminate the first. There are post-Code commentators who retain this outlook, but a large number of them, if not the majority, have no difficulty in accepting plurality even of voluntary quasi-domicile. One quotation will suffice both for establishing this point and as a summary of the whole situation: "Plura quasi-domicilia in iure decretalium fere communi auctorum sententia non admittebantur. Post Codicem tamen nulla est ratio, ob quam quasi-domicilium necessarium cum alio quasi-domicilio libero simul non existant; unanimiter hoc admittunt auctores, iis exceptis qui immerito ipsam existentiam quasi-domicilii

¹ *La Théorie du Domicile et l'Équité Canonique*, Lefèbvre in *E. T. L.*, 1946, p. 114.

² *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1945, XXV, p. 519.

³ E.g. d'Annibale, *Theol. Moralis*, I, §84, n. 23.

necessarii negant. . . . Neque est dubium quasi-domicilium, per animum manendi acquisitum, cum alio, quod sine animo, per solam protractam commorationem acquiritur simul adesse posse; etiam hic consentiunt auctores . . . Dubium solum movebatur a P. Vermeersch, quem secutus est P. Vidal, an possit quasi-domicilium, quod per animum ultra semestre manendi acquiritur, simul cum alio quasi-domicilio, *eodem modo acquisito* subsistere. Praedicti auctores respondent negative, asserendo per animum alibi ultra semestre manendi, primum quasi-domicilium solutum esse; nos, cum P. Maroto, censemus in tali casu primum quasi domicilium non solvi. . . . Censemus ergo duo quasi-domicilia, per animum ultra semestre in loco manendi acquisita, simul persistere posse."¹

The reason for this view, which we think correct, is in canon 95: "Domicilium et quasi-domicilium amittitur discessione a loco cum animo non revertendi . . ." which *teste* Maroto² was finally chosen by the redactors in place of the suggested reading: "quasi-domicilium autem amittitur quoque discessione a loco per sex menses completos, non obstante revertendi animo". This reading represented, it appears, the pre-Code interpretation, since it was then held that the contrary action of a protracted absence terminated a quasi-domicilium, and extinguished, as it were, the intention of returning. The law of the Code excludes this interpretation and recognizes the same principle for terminating both domicile and quasi-domicile. Accordingly, a person studying in Rome, for example, acquires there a quasi-domicile immediately on arriving; if he has to go to Naples for six months and a day to recuperate after a serious illness, intending nevertheless to return to Rome when well, he acquires a second quasi-domicile immediately on arriving at Naples.

CONFESSION BEFORE EXECUTING A "SANATIO"

Further to the point discussed in this REVIEW, 1949, XXI, p. 269, should it not be held that in one matter, at least, the

¹ Vindex in *Jus Pontificium*, 1926, VI, p. 51. Cf. also in the same sense *E.T.L.* loc. cit.

² *Institutiones*, I, §413.

priest executing a *sanatio* must observe the rule applicable to marriages contracted with the canonical form? Confession before the *sanatio* is executed should be urged (canon 1033) on the parties or even imposed (canon 1066), in order to ensure their being in a state of grace. (V.)

REPLY

Canon 1033 . . . eosdemque vehementer adhortetur ut ante matrimonii celebrationem sua peccata diligenter confiteantur, et sanctissimam Eucharistiam pie recipiant.

Canon 1066. Si publicus peccator aut censura notorie innodatus prius ad sacramentalem confessionem accedere aut cum Ecclesia reconciliari recusavit, parochus eius matrimonio ne assistat, nisi gravis urgeat causa, de qua, si fieri possit, consulat Ordinarium.

i. Certainly, any priest exercising the care of souls will try to ensure that the people in his care are in a state of grace, particularly when they are about to receive a sacrament; the "*sanatio*" is, in effect, the sacrament, since up to the moment of its execution the parties are not validly married. Some writers expressly advert to this point, e.g. Heylen¹: "Cum coniuges sacramentum suscipiant, dum ita matrimonium convalidatur, curandum est, in quantum fieri potest, ut sint in statu gratiae."

ii. But, if we regard the priest uniquely as an ecclesiastic executing, or intervening in, the grant of a *sanatio*, he is bound to do only those things directed by the rescript, since this procedure is subject only to the positive laws expressly made for it and to the natural or divine law. It is open to the Holy See or to Ordinaries who issue the rescript to include the terms of canons 1033 and 1066 in the document, and the urging or imposing of confession will then be necessary by virtue of this injunction. Similarly, as pointed out at the end of our previous reply, the parties may be required to submit to other regulations normally to be observed when contracting marriage. It is, indeed, the divine law that a sacrament of the living should be received in a state of grace, but confession is not a necessary means to this

¹ *De Matrimonio*, p. 719.
Vol. xxxii

end except *in voto*. Moreover, the formula of quinquennial faculties relating to the *sanatio* directs the Ordinary, amongst other things, previously to absolve the Catholic party from excommunication "*si casus ferat*"; but this absolution from censure can be granted outside and apart from sacramental confession, unless the rescript imposes confession as a condition when absolution is being obtained in the internal forum.¹ Accordingly, we think it is correct to state that confession before the execution of a *sanatio* cannot be imposed unless the terms of the rescript so direct.

FREQUENT COMMUNION: M.D. CHILDREN

Is there any ruling as to how often Holy Communion should be received by feeble-minded children in our Catholic institutions? (R.)

REPLY

S.C. Conc., 16 December, 1905; Denz. 1985: *Communio frequens et quotidiana . . . omnibus Christifidelibus cuiusvis ordinis aut conditionis pateat, ita ut nemo, qui in statu gratiae sit et cum recta piaque mente ad s. mensam accedat, impediri ab ea possit.*

i. We cannot find any theologian who deals fully with this point. The manualists are usually content with repeating what St Alphonsus has to say "*de semi-fatuis*" in Book VI, §303, of his *Moral Theology*: he cites a number of writers to the effect that the reception of Holy Communion by such should be limited to fulfilling the Easter precept and receiving Viaticum, but Leander is mentioned for the view that its reception is permitted "*toties quoties*". Aertny-Damen adds to St Alphonsus "*aliquoties per annum, pro maiori vel minori gradu discretionis quo utuntur*".² We must remember that writers previous to the reform of Pius X on frequent communion must be read with caution, and it seems to us that the modern commentators have not sufficiently revised the view of St Alphonsus. If we assume

¹ Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, §285.

² *Theol. Moralis*, II, §137.

that the feeble-minded in question, no matter what their actual age, have at least attained the discretion required in a child of seven, no reason can be discerned why Holy Communion should be permitted only a certain number of times. If they are in a state of grace and have a right intention, they may communicate daily like anyone else: a state of grace is, for various reasons, more easily to be taken for granted in the feeble-minded, and the right intention must be measured exactly as it is for the faithful in general. There was something to be said, perhaps, for the view that they may communicate only at Easter and when receiving Viaticum; but we cannot see on what principle they may communicate only a certain number of times, which one writer interprets to mean once a month.¹ Dr M. McGowan, in a C.T.S. pamphlet on Mental Deficiency, mentions incidentally that at Besford Court many of the boys communicate daily. Why not?

ii. The restriction, if any, on the number of times they may communicate is to be determined exactly as it is for any children living in an institution, and the Congregation of the Sacraments, 8 December, 1938, found it necessary to suggest rules for safeguarding the right intention of these communicants.² It may well be, in the case of certain categories of the feeble-minded, that greater caution is necessary for preventing abuse. The judgement of the superiors, who are trained in dealing with these cases, must be accepted, provided it is not based on the principle that the feeble-minded are *ipso facto*, and by reason of their condition, permitted Holy Communion less frequently than those normally constituted; but the persons themselves, in so far as it is possible, must make the decision on the usual principles which apply to all frequent communicants.

VIATICUM TO THE UNCONSCIOUS

Is it lawful, and if so is it obligatory on the priest, to administer the Holy Eucharist to a dying person who is unconscious? (X.)

¹ *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1921, XVIII, p. 191.

² *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1939, XVII, p. 111.

REPLY

Canon 854, §2. In periculo mortis, ut sanctissima Eucharistia pueris ministrari possit ac debeat, satis est ut sciant Corpus Christi a communi cibo discernere illudque reverenter adorare.

Rituale Romanum, IV, i, 10. Amentibus praeterea, seu phreneticis communicare non licet; licebit tamen, si quando habeant lucida intervalla, et devotionem ostendant, dum in eo statu manent, si nullum indignitatis periculum adsit.

The unconscious, other things being equal, may receive Holy Communion validly, and our question is limited to whether they may do so lawfully, namely having regard to the positive law of the Church at the present time. Unfortunately the law does not anywhere expressly decide the point, but the commentators try to reach a decision on analogy with the law of the Code about infants, and also by applying to the unconscious the rubric of the Ritual about persons who have lost the use of reason. We assume, therefore, that before becoming unconscious the person could lawfully receive Viaticum, and it is understood that, though unconscious, the Sacred Species can be consumed without danger of irreverence.

i. The view which has most support from analogous laws is that Viaticum may not lawfully be given to a person who is completely unconscious, and this view is accepted in practice by most priests, we believe, in this country; though their outlook is very likely based on the fear of irreverence, a circumstance which is not strictly relevant, since the danger of vomiting, for example, would forbid Holy Communion to both conscious and unconscious persons. The rubric of the Ritual, without distinguishing between Holy Communion and Viaticum, requires a lucid interval, and canon 854 the ability to distinguish between the Holy Eucharist and ordinary food; in a person completely unconscious both qualifications are clearly lacking.

ii. It is maintained, however, by many that the rubric of the Ritual does not necessarily apply to Holy Communion as Viaticum, and that the criterion in canon 854 should be restricted to infants who have not made their First Communion; for the

case of an adult, who before losing consciousness could have expressly desired Holy Communion, is not the same as that of a child who has never formed this desire at all. The condition of the adult is identical with that discussed by St Thomas,¹ ". . . tunc, si prius, quando erant compotes suae mentis, apparuit in eis devotio huius sacramenti, debet eis in articulo mortis hoc sacramentum exhiberi: nisi forte timeatur periculum vomitus." Relying chiefly on this Thomistic text, the practice of giving Viaticum to the unconscious can be justified, notwithstanding the words of the rubric.²

iii. If it is lawful to administer Viaticum to the unconscious, it would seem to follow that the priest is bound to do so, at least on a principle of charity, lest the dying should be deprived of the grace of this sacrament, and some of the writers, such as Iorio, expressly teach that there is an obligation. The situation is similar to the case of administering certain sacraments to those who are apparently dead, about which the rubrics equally have nothing to say,³ and we incline to the view that in both situations the administration of the appropriate sacraments is obligatory.

Since, however, the law on the whole subject is so uncertain, priests may decide that there is no obligation, and probably the summing up of Gasparri is the best solution to adopt: "Praxis cappellanorum in hospitalibus eadem ubique non est: nonnulli auctorum sententiam sequuntur et in illis circumstantiis viaticum ministrant; plerique verbis *Rituali* stricte adhaerent et nunquam viaticum praebent; tacente auctoritate ecclesiastica, nos nec illos nec istos damnare audemus."⁴

INTERPRETATION OF CONGILIAR LAWS

On the theory of interpreting laws, does the individual Ordinary enjoy the right of authentically interpreting for his diocese the superior law of a Provincial Council? (X.)

¹ *Summa Theol.*, III, 80, 9.

² *Gury-Ferreres, Casus*, II, §319; *Cappello, De Sacramentis*, I, §402; *Iorio, Theol. Moral.*, III, §149.4; *Ecclesiastical Review*, July 1948, p. 24.

³ *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1932, III, p. 228; 1941, XXI, p. 114.

⁴ *De Eucharistia*, II, §1124.

REPLY

Canon 17, §1 : Leges authentice interpretatur legislator eiusve successor et is cui potestas interpretandi fuerit ab eisdem commissa.

§2. Interpretatio authentica, per modum legis exhibita, eandem vim habet ac lex ipsa. . . .

§3. Data autem per modum sententiae iudicialis aut rescripti in re peculiari, vim legis non habet et ligat tantum personas atque efficit res pro quibus data est.

Canon 291, §2 : Decreta Concilii plenarii et provincialis promulgata obligant in suo cuiusque territorio universo, nec Ordinarii locorum ab iisdem dispensare possunt, nisi in casibus particularibus et iusta de causa.

S.C.C., 19 February, 1921 ; *A.A.S.*, 1921, XIII, p. 228 : Exploratum hodie apud omnes est ad potestatem legislativam Episcoporum pertinere ut legibus suis quasi perficiant quod ius commune reliquerit minus definitum et sancitum, ita ut nihil ab ipsis contra ius commune vel eius directionem statui possit.

i. "Unde ius prodiit, interpretatio quoque procedat" is an ancient canonical axiom, which clearly excludes the possibility of an authentic interpretation issuing from an ecclesiastical authority other than that which made the law. Toso is the only canonist we have discovered who appears to teach the contrary: "Eodem modo, quo R.P. cunctas ecclesiasticas leges, Ordinarii locorum, singillatim aut una simul, leges a se latas authentice interpretantur, sive singillatim tulerint (in Synodo diocesano vel extra Synodum), sive coniunctim in Concilio plenario aut provinciali."¹ This is incorrect, in so far as the individual episcopal interpretation is of a higher, e.g. a provincial, law, unless the writer's words are to be understood in the sense explained below, ii, (d). For if the interpretation is authentic it has the force of law, and would accordingly bind wherever the provincial law binds, including places outside the jurisdiction of the individual Bishop, a consequence which is clearly untenable; unless of course the Bishop has been lawfully appointed to give an authentic interpretation, as sometimes happens

¹ *Commentaria Minora*, p. 56.

with conciliar legislation, in much the same way as the *Code Commission* has been appointed for the laws of the Code, "cui uni ius erit Codicis canones authenticæ interpretandi".¹

ii. Provided, however, that it is not thought to extend to an authentic interpretation as defined in canon 17, §2, the episcopal power relating to conciliar legislation, limited to subjects within his jurisdiction, is very considerable, and may be summarized as follows:

(a) He may, from canon 291, §2, dispense the conciliar law in individual cases and for a just reason.²

(b) He may, from canon 17, §3, give a judicial decision which interprets the law for an individual case; or he may let it be known that his decision on any individual case will be according to this interpretation of the conciliar law. It follows, as Brys correctly states: "Ipsis (singulis Episcopis) tantum competit jus (concilii provincialis) interpretandi authenticæ in casibus particularibus, quia ipsorum curae est commissa potestas applicandi in iudicio."³

(c) He may, also, on the usual principles of customary law, authentically declare and sanction for his diocese the existence of a custom contrary to the higher law.⁴

(d) He may, finally, provided nothing is enacted which is manifestly contrary to conciliar legislation, solve doubts existing therein by making diocesan laws: "Praeterea poterunt Ordinarii . . . si id exigat gubernationis necessitas, dubia dirimere, non quidem per modum authenticæ interpretationis legis conciliaris, sed per modum legis diocesanae, quam semper ferre possunt ad boni communis exigentiam, dum certo contraria non fuerit legibus conciliaribus."⁵

Examples of the use of this episcopal power in one or other of the ways above indicated would be, for example, decisions given on the meaning of "spectaculum in publicis theatris" of *IV Westm.*, xi, 9, or of "aedificia . . . nec non alia ad ecclesiam pertinentia" of *I Westm.*, xxv, 4, or "famulae . . . sint provectionis aetatis" of *I Westm.*, xxiv, 4.

E. J. M.

¹ *Motu Proprio*, 15 September, 1917, printed at the beginning of the Code.

² *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1943, XXIII, p. 279.

³ *Compendium*, I, §229.

⁴ Ryan, *Principles of Episcopal Jurisdiction*, p. 135, quoting Rotal decisions.

⁵ Michiels, *Normae*, 1949, I, p. 504, quoting Rodrigo, *De Legibus*, n. 380.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

CENTENARY OF LONDON ORATORY

(Osservatore Romano, 9 June, 1949)

DILECTO FILIO GULIELMO MUNSTER, LONDINIENSIS SODALITATIS A
PHILIPPIANO ORATORIO PRAEPOSITO.

PIUS PP. XII

Dilecte Fili,

salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Quum proxime Londiniensis Sodalitas a Philippiano Oratorio fauste expletum primum celebratura sit saeculum, ex quo condita est, amantius quam suevimus animo Nostro reputamus singularem ortum insignesque fastos istius Instituti, quod, uti et cetera eiusdem generis istic excitata effecit, ut, demirantibus cunctis, vetus Ecclesiae in Anglia stipes, qui aliquibus paene videbatur effectus, vigentibus et florentibus coronaretur virgultis. Paternae caritatis igitur gaudium potius quam officium ducimus quod, hasce ad te scribendo Litteras, tuae et sodalium tuorum festae intersumus celebritati et vobiscum Deo gratias agimus, quod ausis et inceptis in Suam laudem inque Ecclesiae decus et emolumentum inchoatis adspectabiliter pollentia incrementa attribuerit. Decet autem nunc pia memoria honestare et grato obsequio recolere Fridericum Gulielmum Faber, qui isti Oratorio surgenti praefuit, virum singularis fidei ardore et pulchritudinis studio praeditum, cuius ore profluebat sapientiae imber et cuius sermo vivida fuit facula, religiosae rei cultorem eximium, librorum et carminum conditorem disertum. Quamdiu fuerit virtuti et litteris honor, imperitura stabunt tum eius tum Henrici Newman S. R. E. Cardinalis praeclara nomina, quae haud minus Angliae quam Ecclesiae numquam casuram conciliant benevolentiam et gratiam. Quod magnopere gratulati, id nunc optamus cupimusque, ut Coenobium istud, magnis utilitatibus et continenti experientia probatum, magis magisque praestantia et numero sodalium increbescat, fidelis custos illius in cogitando et operando afflatus, qui a Sancto Philippo Nerio quodammodo oritur, quique vos vestraque animat et alit, atque veritatem, caritatem laetitiamque sanctam secundo foedere nectit. Veritas vos faciat liberos, caritas servos, utraque laetos. In restaurando autem religiosae unitatis aedificio, a quo iniqua tempora tam multos Anglos dimove-

runt, erga decerrantes fratres, salva fidei tutela, eodem admoti flamine et proposito potius diversos quam adversos illis vos praestate, conversuris se aliquando vobiscum in unum: illis coniungimini nunc, quantum fieri possit, caritate, eisdem parati olim dare plenitudinem veritatis. Quod ut e votis contingat, Deo fundimus preces, ut uberioris supernae misericordiae dona vobis concedat. Ut autem statae celebritatis dies salutarior evadat, sollemni ritu sacrum peracturo potestatem damus, ut fidelibus Apostolicam Benedictionem cum indulgentia plenaria, sueta lege lucranda impertire valeat. Reliquum nihil Nobis restat nisi ut tibi atque universis qui in istud Philippianum Oratorium sunt cooptati quibusque cum laude praees, necnon iis omnibus, in quorum spiritale commodum elaboratis, simulque operibus et propositis vestris amantissime in Domino benedicamus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die XXVI mensis Maji, anno MDCCCCXXXIX, Pontificatus Nostri undecimo.

PIUS PP. XII

SCHISMATIC "CATHOLIC ACTION" IN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO
SANCTI OFFICII

DECRETUM

SCHISMATICA "ACTIO CATHOLICA" IN CECOSLOVACHIA DAMNATUR
(*Osservatore Romano*, 20-21 June, 1949).

Postremo hoc tempore Ecclesiae Catholicae adversarii in Cecoslovachia falsi nominis "*Actionem Catholicam*" dolose excitarunt, qua illius Reipublicae catholicos inducere conantur, ut ab Ecclesia Catholica deficiant et ab oboedientia legitimis Ecclesiae pastoribus debita recedant.

Quae actio eo est iniquior quod eius agitadores non dubitarunt multos cogere, vi vel dolo, ad nomina sua eidem danda; imo eo pervenerunt ut inter assecclas etiam multos sacerdotes et laicos catholicos recensere atque enuntiare auderent, qui ei numquam adhaeserunt, quin etiam contrariam voluntatem manifestarunt.

Quapropter Suprema Sacra Congregatio Sancti Officii, munere suo fungens fidei ac morum integritatem tuendi, nomine et auctori-

tate SS.mi D. N. D. PII, Div. Prov. Papae XII, praedictam actionem, fraudulenter "*Actionem Catholicam*" nuncupatam, reprobata ac damnata tamquam schismaticam, simulque declarat omnes et singulos, clericos et laicos, qui ei scienter ac sponte iam adhaeserint vel in posterum adhaereant et nominatim eius auctores et promotores, tanquam schismaticos et ab Ecclesia catholica apostatas incurrisse vel incururos esse ipso facto in excommunicationem speciali modo Apostolicae Sedi reservatam, de qua c. 2314, firmis ceteris Iuris Canonici sanctionibus, quibus ipsi deinde erunt plectendi, si (quod Deus avertat) in censura contumaciter perseveraverint.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 20 iunii a. 1949.

PETRUS VIGORITA

Supr. S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.

COMMUNISTS AND MARRIAGE

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO SANCTI OFFICII

DE COMMUNISTARUM MATRIMONII CELEBRATIONE

(*Osservatore Romano*, 16-18 August, 1949)

DECLARATIO

Quaesitum est utrum exclusio communistarum ab usu Sacramentorum in Decreto S. Officii diei 1 iulii 1949 statuta, secum ferat etiam exclusionem a celebrando matrimonio: et quatenus negative, an communistarum matrimonia regantur praescriptis canonum 1060-1061.

Ad rem Sacra Congregatio S. Officii declarat: Attenta speciali natura sacramenti matrimonii, cuius ministri sunt ipsi contrahentes et in quo sacerdos fungitur munere testis ex officio, sacerdos assistere potest matrimoniis communistarum ad normam canonum 1065, 1066.

In matrimoniis vero eorum, de quibus agit n. 4 praefati Decreti, servanda erunt praescripta canonum 1061, 1102, 1109 par. 3.

Datum ex Aedibus S. Officii die 11 augusti 1949.

MARINUS MARANI.

S. Officii Substitutus Notarius.

MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF INDIA

(*Osservatore Romano*, 7 July, 1949)

(To the first Minister Plenipotentiary of the new State of India, who on 6 July, 1949, presented his credentials, the Holy Father made the following reply) :

Mr. Minister :

With heartfelt satisfaction We accept the greetings which Your Excellency as first Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the new State of India, extends to Us in the name of your Government and of your noble people.

This hour takes on the solemn and impressive features of a really historic event.

New dispensations and developments, which perhaps have long been coming to birth, the second World War rather hastening than causing their appearance, now encompass vast areas of the earth. The distant East, above all, has emerged politically, socially and spiritually to a position of first rank, where it is confronted, of course, with duties and responsibilities of a formidable sort, but faces also precious opportunities to further the prosperity and peace of humankind.

In this movement towards new alignments, now in its initial stages, your country along with others is called upon to play an important role, as no alert observer can fail to note.

The new India, which has sent Us in the person of Your Excellency a representative so able and accomplished, is endowed with immense potentialities in view of the transformations looming on the horizon of the near and distant future. Her population and natural resources, her actual and latent productive capacity, along with an imposing spiritual heritage, are assets destined surely to fulfil a special function in contact with other cultures.

An essential element in your spiritual heritage is the earnestness and respect for the religious sentiment, the profound awareness, in the soul of the Indian people, of their dependence on the divine.

He to whom Your Excellency proudly refers as "Father of his Nation" has bequeathed to its people a legacy of great price: a staunch faith in the rightful ascendancy of the spiritual over the material.

Your Excellency has recalled, in warm and grateful words, the spirit of labour and sacrifice which for centuries has marked the

achievement, on Indian soil, of many of Our spiritual sons and daughters.

No one who recognizes, as they do, in the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount an inviolable law of life, and in Him Who proclaimed it the Divine Master and Model sublime, will allow his ideal of generous and unselfish service to be affected by the successive changes in form and content which the political events of recent years have brought in their wake. As always, today and tomorrow, even as yesterday—following the example of Christ and obedient to the teaching of His Vicar who embraces all peoples with equal affection—these children of Ours will harbour no higher aim and boast than to be of service, and by their service to clear the path to real prosperity, peace and happiness for the noble people to which they belong or among whom they labour.

It is a sorry characteristic of our times that there prevails in not a few places a concept of life and society that is vitiated by an excess of materialism or perverted by an outright denial of spiritual values. From the painful effects of such deviation and degeneracy the peoples themselves are the first to suffer. In this way they lose not only their liberty but also their dignity.

Hence it becomes all the more necessary and urgent that the rulers of States and peoples, who recognize in the supremacy of the spirit over matter one of the fundamental laws of their existence and the groundwork of their hopes for the future, should join their forces of individual and collective vigilance to stem the tide of materialism which must needs overflow in the spirit of violence and servitude, by erecting the barrier required to keep the moral patrimony of mankind intact.

In this spiritual alliance of those who are opposed, out of intimate conviction and conscience, to the domination of the spirit by the forces of matter and violence, Divine Providence has assigned to the country of Your Excellency a position of grave responsibility, but also one rich in distinction and in promise of success.

God grant that the new State of India, in point of effective and lasting accomplishment, may measure up to the expectations and high hopes of the world!

Such must indeed be Our trust as We heartily reciprocate the good wishes of the Indian Government and people brought to Us by Your Excellency. We give you the assurance likewise, at the outset of your exalted mission, that you may count upon Our constant understanding and support in all matters designed to develop and strengthen the official relations begun under such happy auspices.

MARRIAGE CAUSES DURING 1948

(A.A.S., 1949, XLI, p. 222)

Except for one case determining rights all the Rotal judgements during 1948 were on marriage causes, the majority being *vis et metus*: twenty-seven were successful and twenty-nine not. On various grounds of defective consent, thirty-three failed and fifteen succeeded. Alleged impotence or non-consummation was proved in nine cases and failed in four. Of the remainder eight cases concerned various impediments and one decided the law on separation.

BOOK REVIEWS

On Englishing the Bible. By Ronald A. Knox. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

WE have here a collection of eight essays, written at various intervals during the "Nine Years' Hard" (the title of one of them) which Mgr Knox spent on translating the Bible (1939-1948). Most of them have appeared in print before, where most of us have read them and enjoyed them: indeed five of them appeared in the present journal. Certain of these articles are indeed *loci classici* on the art of translation: everyone will remember the one that appeared in 1945 after the publication of the New Testament, entitled *Some Reasons Why*, where the translator fences with a critic whom he calls Glaucon, and in particular defends his use of certain circumlocutions. Whether we agree entirely with Mgr Knox's practical conclusions or not, at any rate we have here an apologia of certain aspects of his method and an exposition of certain of his principles of translation. Another *locus classicus* is the article that appeared, also in the present journal, at the conclusion of the work on the Old Testament in 1948, and entitled *Farewell to Machabees*, in which the translator's axioms, to be accurate, intelligible and readable, are discussed in relation to problems of translating the Old Testament.

A similar but more general treatment of the principles of translation that guided Mgr Knox in his work is found in the essay entitled *Thoughts on Bible Translation*, which was originally a paper read to the Conference of Higher Studies at Upholland, while work on the New Testament was in progress, and which has not been fully printed before. *Nine Years' Hard* is the title given to the text of a recent broadcast on Radio Eireann, which is a more popular account of the whole labour.

Three others of the present essays are reprints of articles in the present journal dealing with particular problems of translation: *Some New Testament Problems* discusses the hesitations and tentative solutions connected with particular words and phrases ("Let me commit to paper some of the hesitations which make themselves felt when you sit down, trying to forget that you have ever read the Bible before, to contemplate a verse of the Vulgate, with the Greek printed on the opposite side of the page, and ask yourself, What is the English for this?"). *Justice and Scandal in the Gospels* is a study of those particular words. And *Morsu Amarissimo* (understanding the previous words in the canticle of Moses "devorabunt eos aves") is a typical Knoxian title for his answer to Dr Bird's criticism in the *Tablet* of his Psalms, after their appearance in 1947.

The remaining essay in this book is one that was contributed to a memorial volume to Bishop Challoner brought out by the *Westminster Cathedral Chronicle*. It is a short essay on *Challoner and the Douay Version*.

It is indeed valuable to have these articles collected in a single book. They make good reading anyway, but certain of them, the *loci classici* mentioned above, are of permanent value and importance. It is a pity that although it is stated in the preface where the articles were printed before, no dates are given of their publication. Such dates (although we can hunt them up in our back numbers) would have given a clearer impression of their context. It is also a pity that Fr Thomas Corbishley's little sketch of Mgr Knox at work, which appeared in *The Month* for July 1949, had not yet been printed, for it would have made a pleasing epilogue. A further pity is the ridiculous transliteration of Greek words that crop up now and then. They might have allowed Monsignor a little Greek type.

In the preface the author forestalls the criticism "... it was all very well to throw off an article, now and then, about Bible translation; by-products of the process, sparks from my anvil; but why republish them?" In his preface to the Old Testament Mgr Knox says that this translation is no more than an expression of his idea of how the Old Testament ought to be translated. He says here that he feels that

a book like the present, where principles and methods of translation are discussed, "has more permanent value than any translation I have done, or could do . . . There will be more translations yet", and his own contribution is more permanent in its clarification of principle than in a particular translation of a given passage, and it is this that may give guidance to "each new adventurer" in the future: "let him ask, not how I did the thing, but how I thought the thing ought to be done".

Lastly, let us observe that an apologia of the methods and principles governing a translation was usual in the lengthy prefaces or "annotations" printed with the Catholic versions of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. One thinks of the careful explanations prefixed to Rheims and Douay, and to the New Testaments of Dr Witham and Dr Nary. There is no doubt about the methods and principles underlying their translations. But the day of long prefaces is over. The American Protestant *Revised Standard Version* ("the most important publication of 1946", the jacket said) had a companion booklet of explanation, and it is right that we should have an apologia from Mgr Knox. We should have been spared much trouble and investigation if only Dr Challoner had done likewise.

SEBASTIAN BULLOUGH, O.P.

Old Testament Stories. By Dom Hubert van Zeller, O.S.B., being Vol. II of the series of Scripture Textbooks for Catholic Schools. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s. 6d.)

IN one way it is difficult for the present writer to review this book, since he himself has written two of the other five in the series and has been associated with them all from the beginning. But in another way it is easy and delightful, for he is able to see clearly, since his own volumes are written for IVth and VIth Forms at school, how perfectly fitted this book is to the requirements of a IIInd Form (12-13 years of age).

The six volumes correspond to the six forms of the average school: Form I begins with the fundamental thing, the Life of Our Lord (Dr Crean); Form II goes back to the Old Testament; Form III returns to the Gospels (Dr Bird); Form IV proceeds to the Acts; Form V returns to the Gospels, seen in the light of the Old Testament (Fr Jones); and Form VI completes the work with the Epistles and the Apocalypse.

This present Second Volume was indeed written for this place in the series, but in 1943 the production of the series as a whole could not in those difficult years be attempted, and the volume was issued

as an independent venture under the delightful title *From Creation to Christmas*. The book was, very rightly, generally acclaimed; which goes to show that we all like being talked to like twelve-year-olds, provided we are talked to and not talked down to. The format of the 1943 edition was much larger (and therefore also thinner) and was illustrated by lovely coloured reproductions of William Hole's biblical pictures. The present edition is in line with the very pleasing (smaller) format of the series, though the binding of all the series perhaps leaves a little to be desired. Also in line with the other volumes are the illustrations from photographs either of Palestinian landscapes, etc., or in this case of modern Palestinian types and their activities. One regrets the perhaps inevitable disappearance of the excellent biblical scenes of the solitary volume. The alteration of the title is also a pity: *Old Testament Stories* is less true to the contents of the book than the sparkling title of 1943, especially in view of the statement in the preface that "because the Bible is a history, it is as well that we should follow it as a history, and not as a series of disjointed stories". It is a main theme of the book that the story that extends from creation to Christmas is a single story, and Fr Hubert has "arranged the Old Testament narrative in continuous and connected form, so that the essential incidents and leading characters emerge as real happenings and live people" (blurb). The text is unchanged from 1943.

Anyone who has taught a IIInd Form knows that the serial story that goes on from class to class through the whole year is a pedagogic method that captures the class at once. A year of Old Testament in this way is a joy to teach, and Fr Hubert knows this and imparts his joy to the reader, be he in the IIInd Form or very much older. Part of the technique is to paint the heroes with high lights and, not cluttering up the canvas with minor characters, to leave them with honourable mention in a vague background. Some chapter headings will show the method. Moses. Moses again. Moses yet again. Judges: especially Debbora. Further Judges: especially Gedeon. (Two more such chapters.) David in exile. David as King. David later on. Roboam, Jeroboam, and all those.

A particularly ingenious device is the provision of five appendices, which are devoted to five detached stories, delightfully told, each of which is complete in itself but does not fit with any certainty into the big story which is the history of the Old Testament. The five stories are those of Tobias, Judith, Esther, Ruth and Job. Fr Hubert is almost at his very best when telling these stories, and the fact that each stands by itself on its own merits in an appendix by-passes the problem, so irrelevant to the stories themselves, of where they fit into

the framework of the Old Testament, and, still more irrelevant, of when they were written.

If anyone sees this book in a bookshop or stall, let him turn for a taste of its manner to the last thing in the book (except for the rough chronological chart), which is Appendix V on Job. It is a matter of five pages and the drama of Job is entrancingly unfolded, sometimes using the classical words of Douay (and then, as always in this book, printed in italics) and sometimes (as often in the rest of the book) enacting the scene in fresh modern dialogue. It is tempting to give excerpts, but this would be unfair, as the whole story is so much of an entity. And the same must be said of the entity that is the whole story from creation to Christmas.

During its six years' run as an independent volume this book has proved to many teachers (including the present writer) its worth in the classroom, and it is to be hoped that many ordinary readers will continue to find their way to it even though it is now presented as a textbook. And Mgr Barton is to be congratulated on now having it in the series of which he is the editor.

SEBASTIAN BULLOUGH, O.P.

Dante The Philosopher. By Etienne Gilson. Translated by David Moore. Pp. xii + 338. (Sheed and Ward. 15s.)

THE title of this book is somewhat misleading. M. Gilson has not given us an account and description of Dante's philosophical ideas so much as a definition of his attitude to philosophy. He believes that an understanding of the way in which Dante conceived philosophy and of the use to which he put it is the key to his true originality as a philosopher. Unfortunately the opinions of authorities on this matter are divergent and the author has found himself in opposition to some of them. Notably he is opposed to the interpretation of Fr Mandonnet and has felt himself obliged to discuss this question at some length. While regretting this necessity he sees no way of avoiding it. The first part of the book is primarily concerned with a critical discussion of Fr Mandonnet's interpretation. The writer does this effectively and vigorously, but to one who has not read Fr Mandonnet's *Dante le Théologien* it seems a little unlikely that such an eminent authority should have allowed his enthusiasm for Thomism to have blinded him so completely to the shortcomings and extravagances of the interpretation which he adopted. It is hard to avoid feeling that Dante the theologian is not such an inconceivable figure as Professor Gilson would have us believe. It is possible however that those versed in Dantesque criticism will revel in this section of the book.

The positive sections of the book are to the uninitiated much more interesting. Professor Gilson examines the main writings of Dante and gradually builds up a well-thought-out interpretation of his attitude to philosophy. Particularly interesting is the view expressed that for Dante the distinction of orders from each other does not involve their hierarchical gradation, as it did for St Thomas. This enables him to speak of the Pope and Emperor as supreme principles each in a different genus—*non potest dici quod alterum subalternetur alteri*—advocating not that kind of independence of temporal from spiritual authority which would imply a divorce of the two, but rather the coexistence of two authorities equally deriving from God, of which one is to the other as nature is to grace. The need for an emperor as a universal temporal monarch is due to the fact that the total intelligible knowledge which is accessible to the human species can be achieved only on condition that the entire human species exists as a universal community endowed with a kind of existence of its own and having this achievement of universal knowledge as its special function. This appears to be a novel argument for the existence of a universal monarchy. Moreover, Dante's conception of the universal monarchy owes much to his knowledge of the Church. "If the *genus humanum* of Dante is really the first known expression of the modern idea of Humanity, we may say that the conception of Humanity first presented itself to the European consciousness merely as a secularized imitation of the religious notion of a Church" (p. 179).

The same conception of distinct orders which lack the hierarchical gradation so dear to Thomism characterizes Dante's view of the relationship of philosophy and theology. In fact the independence of philosophy from theology is in a sense a corollary of the similar independence of the temporal from the spiritual sovereign.

Professor Gilson's conclusion is that Dante in his work adopted the attitude of a defender of the public weal. "His special function is not to promote philosophy, nor to teach theology, nor to demonstrate the working of the Empire; but to inspire these fundamental authorities once more with the mutual respect which their divine origin exacts from them." His attacks upon the representatives of these authorities springs from his love of "the great spiritual realities which he accuses them of undermining through failure to respect their limits, since each of these realities destroys itself by usurping the power of another no less than it destroys that power by usurping it" (p. 280).

Apart from the critical and positive sections of his book Professor

Gilson has interjected here and there delightful parentheses dealing with questions of poetic inspiration and Muses, treating these questions always with a light and sure touch. G. E.

Religious Life in Christ. By Theodosius Foley, O.F.M. Cap. Pp. viii + 163. \$2.50. *Marvels of Grace.* By Victor Many, S.S. Pp. xvii + 88. \$1.75. *My God and My All.* By Ven. Leonard Lessius, S.J. xi + 114. \$2.00. (Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee.)

THESE three publications from America are valuable additions to any library of spiritual books. The volume whose title is first given is composed of conferences to Religious by a Retreat master of long experience, who has modelled his work upon "Christ, the Ideal of religious perfection". Everything is referred to Our Divine Lord. We begin by sitting at His knees to learn meekness and humility, and we end by seeing the whole content of His doctrine concentrated in His Commandment of Charity. Fr Theodosius has succeeded in pointing out clearly to Religious that the one golden rule of their lives is in "Come, follow Me".

Père Many's work was written in French. It is here translated by Father Talbot, who has striven with the utmost fidelity to give the author's exact ideas, ideas rich in the beauty found nowhere but in the doctrine of Christ. The theme of the book is man's close kinship with his Saviour; nothing less than his participation in the divine nature by the power of grace. Not often does one finish the reading of a new book with such consolation as is here imparted. This translation will doubtless share the widespread popularity of the original work.

My God and My All is also a translation, but of a Latin work; it is put into English by Fr John Foster, S.J. This is a volume of meditations upon the divine attributes of God: His Infinity, Imensity, Sanctity. As might be expected, Holy Scripture is the stem from which spring the author's flowering reflections. The book is replete with lovely thoughts beautifully expressed; it is characteristic of the works of one who is everywhere recognized as a master of the spiritual life.

A Simple Way of Love. By a Poor Clare. Pp. vii + 104. (Burns Oates. 6s.)

NUNS more than any other class of reader will appreciate this little book to the full. It was written by the Abbess of a Poor Clare convent who is now dead, but her work lives with the true religious spirit that flourishes among those vowed to the special service of God.

Such souls need charity, humility, patience, simplicity, joy, and all the other gifts that come with the abiding grace of the Holy Spirit. These things are here spoken of by one who understood them; they made up her earthly existence.

Why do girls go into convents? is a question often asked by non-Catholics, and not rarely by Catholics themselves. The simplest answer is: "To love God," which explains the title of this book. Everything in the life of a Religious is directed to the one end of following perfectly the first and greatest Commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." One immediate reward that will come to every student of this earnest little work is the relief of seeing how open and direct is the way to God by love.

L. T. H.

Sister Xavier Berkeley. By M. L. H. Pp. xxii + 257. (Burns Oates. 15s.)

THE state of religion is a state of poverty. Yet there are, one supposes, only few men and women who, on becoming religious, do not begin to live in better material surroundings than the circumstances of their birth have accustomed them to. Few of us grow up in a country mansion surrounded by parkland; few of us are so waited upon as to attain the age of 20 in complete ignorance of the uses of bootbrushes and blacking. Agnes Berkeley did; then she offered herself to the Sisters of Charity, and became a missionary in China. She had learned to clean boots in the novitiate. In China she learned to deal with mandarins, bandits, hostile troops, cholera, beri-beri, prisoners; learned to live from hand to mouth whilst she daily fed hundreds of orphans, poor, idiots; learned to lance wounds, give injections, baptize the dying; learned to endure life in the midst of evil smells and yet more evil morals, and, better still, learned to cure both; learned to build, to plant, to start industry; learned to love her "Lords and Masters the Poor". It was no easy lesson; and she learned it by the light of her ceaseless union with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. She had no other mentor, and she asked none. With Him for companion she worked for 54 long years in the Far East, suffering from boils induced by heat, suffering, in the early days, from the weight of clothes designed for Northern Europe and not China, and from the want of mosquito-netting, wearing an old patched habit and home-made shoes. The people she served said she had forgotten she was English and had become Chinese: precious tribute to a missionary.

There are no accounts, in this book, of ecstasies and frightening

penances, only of an utterly selfless devotion to duty for Our Lord's sake. Sister Berkeley's was the unobtrusive English way of holiness; it was to be attained to through work well done, and prayer persevered in; at the end, being 83 years old and on her deathbed, she could say: "Oh! I am so weary, so weary. I can do no more." It is a noble and a holy life; the story of it is well told; and there is inspiration in it for those who aspire to serve God in the quest for souls, especially, perhaps, in these words of Sister Berkeley's: "To win souls for God, one must suffer. Before, God asked blood for souls from the martyrs; now He asks suffering."

S. M. S.

STORIES FOR CHILDREN

The Ghost Shop. By Gerard F. Scriven. Pp. 104. (Samuel Walker, Chancery Lane. 5s.)

CHILDREN like to be given the creeps by way of a change from the thrills of ordinary story-telling, as Father Scriven well understood when he wrote *The Ghost Shop*. It proved to be his last book, his lamented death occurring whilst it was in the press. In this series of ghost stories he succeeds in giving his young readers the creeps without the horrors. Children's minds thrive on excitement and fun, but fear need never be instilled.

Although the book is primarily for children it will find ample appreciation among their elders. Fingle Street, Cut-throat Caroline, Mr Fishwickle, Rummyole Castle, Mrs Tenpenny and Jacob C. Warchope are random instances of the author's inventiveness in the names of people and places—all different yet with an indefinable family likeness. The many stories in the book have a bearing one upon another, but each is complete in itself. These chapters "read aloud" to perfection, and that, after all, is the test of the good story.

Now Welcome Summer. By Francis Herlihy. Pp. 255. (Clonmore & Reynolds. 8s. 6d.)

In this extremely well-written book a missionary priest tells of his adventurous life among the Japanese, and of what befell him in his travels to and from the Far East. It is not, strictly speaking, a story-book, because every word set down is true. It is history; but exhilarating and exciting history which would give it an immediate priority in a whole library of tales of mystery and imagination.

There is not a large selection of books that warm the enthusiasm

of boys who lean towards the priesthood, but this is one of them. The sublime vocation of the missionary shines brightly from these pages which tell of the adventures a priest encounters in the greatest adventure of all—carrying the Faith into pagan lands. The author has not deliberately written his book as propaganda, but it will certainly have the effect of a careful campaign to foster priestly vocations. An ideal gift for altar-servers and choirboys.

Little Patron of Gardeners. By Catherine Beebe. Pp. 40. 50 cents.

Kulik's First Seal Hunt. By Alma Savage. Pp. xi + 114. \$1.50.

And the Winds Blew. By Brother Ernest. C.S.C. Pp. xi + 227. \$1.50. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey.)

SAINT FIACRE is the *Little Patron of Gardeners*, the holy man who gave his name to the Continental cab. How the Irish boy became a monk, the monk of the miraculous garden, and why he gave his name to cabs, makes a very pleasing tale as told by Mrs Beebe. Her husband has drawn the illustrations, one for every page, and no child could desire firmer, clearer pictures. The book is strongly bound in a pliable cover for small hands to hold.

Since an Eskimo boy is born to be a hunter, it came as second nature to Kulik to be trained from his cradle for the skilful work of killing seals, which means that he was taught whilst still a small boy to shoot, to drive dogs, to manage a boat and a sled. At last he was ready for his life's first big adventure. Alaska makes a picturesque background for this "boy's own story" of hardship and danger bravely endured. Eskimos seem to possess many of the natural gifts of the animals they work with, and their dogs have instincts uncannily akin to human intelligence.

Jerry Donahue, a native Irish lad, is the hero of Brother Ernest's most recent story-book, and a true hero he proves himself. Good luck does not help him very much. He appears to face adversity from his early boyhood, but he does so as a good Catholic; and of course he triumphs in the end. The end is a long time coming, and before it is reached Jerry gets as far away from home as India. His story is told with dramatic skill, and it is pointed throughout with well-directed moral lessons which make it a truly Catholic tale.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE
THE FAMILY CRUSADE

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1949, XXXII, p. 30)

The Salvatorian Fathers write:

Mr C. J. Woollen's interesting and timely article on *The Family Crusade*, which appeared in the July issue of THE CLERGY REVIEW, prompts us to draw attention to the Salvatorian Crusade for Catholic Family Life, founded and directed by the English Province of the Society of the Divine Saviour (Salvatorian Fathers). This Crusade is an attempt to put into practice the admirable suggestions made in Mr Woollen's article. Seeing that every priest, from the Holy Father to the humblest curate, is convinced of the need for the sanctification of family life, readers of THE CLERGY REVIEW may be interested to know something of the constitution and rules of this special Salvatorian work.

Our Family Crusade was founded early this year. For two months it was advertised in *The Apostle*, the Salvatorian monthly for the Catholic Family. Its work began officially in Our Lady's month of May. The Crusade is under the patronage of the Holy Family, and its patronal feast is the Feast of the Holy Family. Its purpose is the sanctification of family life by the faithful following of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, in their family life at Nazareth. The rules are simple: (1) The daily recitation of the Family Rosary; (2) The offering of one decade of each Family Rosary for members of the Crusade; (3) The offering of the "Hail Holy Queen" for an increase of truly Catholic family life.

Membership is open to all Catholic families, however constituted, i.e. married people and the children, married people without children: widows or widowers and their children: unmarried brothers and/or sisters, living together in a family. Thus, Catholic families of all kinds are enabled to share in the benefits of the Crusade. There is a special place for engaged couples, i.e. those who are formally engaged, and those who have agreed to marry, but have not yet reached the stage of a formal engagement. The inclusion of these provides an opportunity to instruct them in the preparation for Holy Matrimony, and ensures that their preparation is prayerful through the daily recitation of the Family Rosary.

Each month, two pages of *The Apostle* are devoted to Crusade Notes. These provide instruction for members regarding the part they are to play, singly and together, in the sanctification of themselves and their family life, and in their proper preparation for

marriage. The example of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph is kept before them, and is applied in a practical manner to the daily lives of children, mothers, fathers, husbands and wives. Addresses of the Holy Father, bishops, priests, and Catholic laymen are quoted from time to time in an endeavour to deepen the convictions of members regarding the necessity and excellence of the work they have undertaken. Members are encouraged to send questions concerning their problems and difficulties in family life and preparation for marriage. These are treated in strict confidence, and replies appear only under the initials of the sender. A General Intention, to be remembered in the Family Rosaries, is suggested each month. Married members are greeted on the anniversaries of their weddings, and their welfare is recommended to the prayers of other members.

So far, our membership is mainly confined to those who subscribe to *The Apostle*, nor have we succeeded in enrolling the majority of these. This fact shows that the work of the Crusade is slow to attract even good Catholics, and this, in turn, is a sign of its necessity, as well as an indication that it comes from God. But the membership is growing steadily. In view of the fact that our propagation of the Crusade has so far been limited to *The Apostle*, the slow increase of members is understandable, and its steadiness is heartening. The fact that we have little access to individual families and engaged couples in the parishes naturally hampers our apostolate in this matter.

There may be priests who, convinced of the need for truly Catholic family life, are impeded by lack of some means to promote it. To these we would gladly offer the aid of the Salvatorian Crusade for Catholic Family Life. We have leaflets which contain all information about the Crusade. Attached to these are enrolment forms for families and engaged couples. We would welcome enquiries for these, and be happy to send samples of them to those who are interested. Here we wish to make it clear that a subscription to our magazine is not essential for membership of the Crusade. Those who enrol, and who wish to have a certificate of membership, are asked to send us one shilling to cover the cost of printing, but, again, the purchase of a certificate is not essential. At the same time, let us say that the Crusade Notes in *The Apostle* serve as practical spiritual direction to members, while the certificate, framed in the home, would be a daily reminder of the grand apostolate to which members are pledged.

Our address is: S.C.C.F.L., Salvatorian College, Christleton Hall, Chester.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

re
of
he
m
ers
er-
eir
ge.
er
in
re
is

b-
ty
to
es-
n-
on
n-
g.
ed
his

ly
ote
u-
n-
ms
or
er-
ra-
ol,
nd
ase
he
to
ily

on
